

today to the unlawful search and seizure of the American-flag ships *Arctic Maid* and *Santa Ana* by Ecuador, I believe it desirable to extend my remarks to include additional information which I obtained from the Department of State.

Only a few short weeks ago, Mr. Nick Bez, of Seattle, Wash., a well-known fishing operator and a constituent of mine, paid \$5,000 tribute to the Government of Peru for the release of his ships, the *Western Clipper* and the *Tony Bee*. Both of these ships asked sanctuary of the Peruvian Government, one for needed emergency repairs and the other for medical assistance for a sick crewman. After granting asylum to these fishing vessels and their crews, and literally inviting them into the protection of the

harbor of Calloa, the Government of Peru seized the ships and to all intents and purposes held them for ransom. Three weeks ago eight American-flag fishing craft were seized, again by the Peruvian Government, and \$2,000 more American ransom dollars were paid out before their release could be effected. On September 4, 1954, the *Sunstreak*, an American-flag ship owned by Mr. Jack Crivello, of San Diego, was confiscated by Ecuador. Mr. Crivello paid between \$12,000 and \$13,000 for the release of his ship, and, pursuant to Public Law 680 of the 83d Congress, has filed a claim in this connection with the Department of State.

These are acts of piracy, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I ask, how long will these acts

of modern-day banditry be tolerated? How long will citizens of this country sailing under the protection of the Stars and Stripes be subjected to the indignities of forcible detention by foreign governments until tribute is paid for their release? I suggest that it is about time the United States ceased protesting and started protecting our American persons and property. The echoes of that stirring slogan of early years, "Millions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute," once echoed loudly in this land of freedom. In our position of world leadership it should resound from shore to shore, today louder and with far greater determination and firmness than ever before in our history.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, beyond whose brooding care we cannot drift: In the glory and vigor of a new morning we lift our careworn hearts to Thee, as we set our faces once more toward waiting tasks and toils. We fain would quiet our souls in Thy presence and rest ourselves in the confidence of Thy sustaining strength, that the peace of God which passeth all understanding may guard our hearts and thoughts. Through countless channels Thou dost seek our lives. At many a door Thou dost stand and knock, if we would but heed the gentle accents of Thy call.

In all the strident voices of this tumultuous day may we not miss the still, small voice which alone can change our fear to faith and our cowardice to courage. Harken to the prayers of our hearts when in our highest moments we forget ourselves and think of Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 16, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 913) to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet, *Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?*;

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a report on the Prayer Room established in the Capitol;

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Committee on Government Operations on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs; and

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes, was read twice by its title and referred

to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following House concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

House Concurrent Resolution 85

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the author of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?", as set out in House Document No. 465, 79th Congress, and subsequent editions thereof, revise the same, bring it up to date, and that it be printed as a public document.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a House document, and there shall be printed 300,000 additional copies, of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 266,150 for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate Document Room; and 6,000 for the House Document Room.

House Concurrent Resolution 90

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to prepare a report on the origin, establishment, furnishing, and decoration of the Prayer Room established by House Concurrent Resolution 60 of the 83d Congress for use of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Such report shall be printed as a House document with illustrations, in accordance with regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed 100 copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress.

SEC. 3. As used in this resolution, the term "Member of Congress" includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of, and a Delegate to, the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO CERTAIN REORGANIZATION PLANS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2576) to further

amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 17, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 942) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

As in legislative session,

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee on Investigation of Union Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in order to expedite the work of the Committee on Appropriations in the remaining months of the present session of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to meet when necessary during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with statements made in connection therewith limited to not exceeding 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have asked the minority leader to give consideration to the possibility of the Senate's taking up today Calendar No. 107, a bill (S. 1325) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; Calendar No. 108, a bill (S.

1326) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; Calendar No. 109, a bill (S. 1327) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; Calendar No. 110, a bill (S. 1436) to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and for other purposes; and Calendar No. 111, a bill (S. 1457) to redetermine the national marketing quotas for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

I understand those bills have been reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and that there is no opposition to them. It may be that after concluding the business scheduled for today I shall desire to move the consideration of those bills.

I wished to make that announcement at this time.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 14)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Federal Civil Defense Administration, in the amount of \$12 million, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS IN EXCESS OF \$50,000 AWARDED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth semiannual report of contracts, in excess of \$50,000, for research, development, and experimental purposes, awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C.,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of that Corporation on tin operations, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration, as of June 30, 1954, including the annual report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

GAIN FROM SALE OR EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY REQUIRED BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a problem which has arisen as a result of that Commission's obligations under section 1071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the gain from the sale or exchange of certain property; to the Committee on Finance.

JOURNAL OF SENATE OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Journal of the Senate, Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, special session of 1954 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA (H. Doc. No. 110)

A letter from the chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, National Council, New Brunswick, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 45th Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the con-

duct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

COVER ON MAIL OF SENATORS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letter from the Assistant Attorney General, which was read, and, with the accompanying exhibits, was ordered to be placed on file:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, March 17, 1955.

HON. FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Your memorandum of March 10, 1955, directing the report of the Special Committee on Investigation of Cover on Mail of Senators to the attention of the Attorney General for appropriate action has been referred to the Criminal Division.

The material transmitted has been examined and found to be essentially the same as that made available to us by United States Senator CARL HAYDEN under cover of his letter dated December 14, 1954. Senator HAYDEN requested at that time that he be advised whether there was any violation of Federal law based upon the facts and evidence adduced. We advised Senator HAYDEN in a letter of January 5, 1955, that we had concluded from our examination of the materials in the light of the applicable law that the mail cover did not violate any Federal criminal statute. Upon a reexamination of our file in the light of the material submitted with your memorandum, we have reached the same conclusion.

We are returning the original exhibits forwarded with your memorandum.

Sincerely,

WARREN OLNEY III,
Assistant Attorney General.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"A concurrent resolution petitioning the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Department of Defense to appoint a committee to investigate and study the proposed closing of Camp Kilmer and to defer closing of this military establishment until completion of such investigation

"Whereas the Department of Defense has announced that it intends to close the military establishment known as Camp Kilmer located in Middlesex County in the State of New Jersey on or about June 30, 1955; and

"Whereas the Federal Government acquired approximately 1,900 acres of land in the establishment of Camp Kilmer, adversely affecting the ratables in several municipalities; and

"Whereas the area adjacent to the military installation has undergone a period of economic adjustment and large capital investments have been made in order to antici-

pate the needs of Camp Kilmer and its personnel; and

"Whereas the closing of Camp Kilmer will result in great economic dislocation in this defense area: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):

"1. It is respectfully requested that Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, or Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, appoint a committee composed of representatives of the Federal Government as well as citizens from the community to investigate and study the proposed closing of the military establishment known as Camp Kilmer in Middlesex County and that the closing of Camp Kilmer be deferred until such committee has had an opportunity to study and submit a report.

"2. The secretary of the senate is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This concurrent resolution shall take effect immediately.

"BRUCE A. WALLACE,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"O. J. VAN CAMP,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Director of Fish and Wildlife Service, and Territorial Delegate to Congress:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas reindeer stations and wildlife refuges withdrawn from public entry by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Fish and Wildlife Service are closed to mining and prospecting in Alaska; and

"Whereas these particular withdrawals total more than 8 million acres; and

"Whereas many known deposits of lode and placer gold, strategic and industrial minerals, and coal exist within these withdrawn areas; and

"Whereas in the case of St. Lawrence Island, which is withdrawn as a reindeer station, only approximately 90 head of reindeer exist and more cannot be supported there for 50 to 100 years in the future because of extreme overgrazing in the past and the slow growth of the lichens and moss on which they feed; and

"Whereas mining operations on St. Lawrence Island, which is usually a hardship area, would create employment opportunities for the native Eskimos and aid their economy; and

"Whereas in the case of the large wildlife refuges on Kodiak Island, the Aleutian Islands, and the Kenai Peninsula, orderly prospecting and mining could be carried on without disturbing the wildlife under protection and with no conflict with the control or regulations of the Fish and Wildlife Service as is done in some wildlife refuges in the States.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that these withdrawn lands be opened to prospecting and mining by the respective agencies concerned.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 24, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 4, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Richard Nixon, President of the United States Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; the Honorable Carl Hayden, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the people of Alaska desire to attract new industry and new population to the Territory, to develop Alaska's economy to a high level, resulting in a higher standard of living and the creation of taxable treasure through utilization of natural resources; and

"Whereas Wood Canyon on the Copper River, the largest remaining undeveloped hydroelectric power site on the Pacific coast of the United States, has been under investigation during the past few years; and

"Whereas development of the Wood Canyon power site would attract and permit the establishment of aluminum and/or other light metals industries and other large consumers of low-cost hydroelectric energy in the electrochemical and electrometallurgical fields; and

"Whereas copper deposits in the region are not being worked during a period of serious copper shortages throughout the free world owing to the lack of surface transportation to Cordova, Alaska, a year-round, deep-water seaport; and

"Whereas the Katalla petroleum province, also adjacent to Cordova, cannot be explored adequately, or brought into actual production without construction of an access road link with Cordova; and

"Whereas the Bering River coalfield, estimated to cover more than 50 square miles and to contain more than 2 billion tons of coal ranging in rank from subbituminous to anthracite, including unknown quantities of metallurgical-grade coking coal, remains undeveloped because no highway links the coalfield with port facilities at Cordova; and

"Whereas it already has been demonstrated that construction of the Copper River Highway not only is feasible from the engineering standpoint, but also may be placed in the low-cost construction category since use of the abandoned Copper River and Northwestern Railroad bed, including several steel bridges which are in good condition, are involved; and

"Whereas the 109-mile right-of-way is the property of the United States Government; and

"Whereas construction of the Copper River Highway would provide an alternative route from the Gulf of Alaska to defense installations in interior Alaska, important to the defense scheme of the Territory.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully urges that the construction program of the Copper River Highway, now under way on a piecemeal basis, be accelerated to permit development of resources of the region at the earliest possible moment.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 4, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 8, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the traffic managers conference of southern California, Los Angeles, Cal., signed by F. Z. Wakefield, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that conference, relating to the fiscal and financial policies of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Mary J. Richards, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Highway Officials of North Atlantic States, at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to the Federal aid for highways program; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"A concurrent resolution requesting the two United States Senators and the United States Congressmen from the Second and Third Districts of South Carolina to investigate the possibility of obtaining Federal aid for property owners in Aiken, Edgefield, McCormick, and Saluda Counties who suffered losses as a result of the wind and hail storm on the night of March 13-14.

"Whereas property owners in Aiken, Edgefield, McCormick, and Saluda Counties suffered severe losses to their crops and other property as a result of the wind and hail storm which struck with terrific force on the night of March 13-14; and

"Whereas many such property owners are without financial ability to repair and replace such losses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the two United States Senators from South Carolina and the Members of the United States Congress from the Second and Third Congressional Districts are requested to investigate the possibility of obtaining Federal aid for the property owners in Aiken, Edgefield, McCormick, and Saluda Counties; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished the two United States Senators and the Members of the Congress of the United States from the Second and Third Congressional Districts."

REHABILITATION OF PAPAGO TRIBE OF INDIANS—RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to the Papago Indian Reservation.

The resolution recommends that a program be established for the rehabilitation of that tribe of Indians and the protection and better utilization of the resources of the tribe.

In this connection, Mr. President, I may state that there is pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a bill (S. 54) to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, introduced by my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and myself, which this memorial supports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution, presented by Mr. HAYDEN, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

House Memorial 1

Memorial requesting Congress to create a program for the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians for the protection of and better utilization of the resources of the tribe

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The Papago Tribe of Indians, located on the second largest reservation in the United States comprising almost 3 million acres in southern Arizona, is the only tribe of Indians on a reservation in the United States that does not have the right to minerals under the land.

This unfair condition exists in spite of the fact that the United States in the Gadsden Purchase Treaty in 1854 promised to protect the rights of the inhabitants of that area when it was transferred from Mexican to American sovereignty. This discrimination against the Papagos is the result of pressure brought on President Woodrow Wilson at the time in 1916 when he set aside the land for an Indian reservation. In 1932, acting upon representations made by attorneys for the Papagos, the then Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Ray L. Wilbur, closed the reservation to mineral entry. However, in 1934, a rider denying the Papagos the mineral rights was attached to the Indian reorganization bill. This has brought about a condition in which the Papagos face the prospect of losing their reservation piecemeal because both large companies and amateur prospectors are searching for uranium and other minerals on the Indian land. If a prospector can prove there is mineral under his stake, he can file a claim and work the land. Even sand and gravel claims can be filed.

In substantiation of this claim it might be pointed out that as of August 18, 1954, 410 mining claims encompassing over 11,000 acres of land had been located, and 202 claims encompassing almost 4,000 acres of Papago land had been patented.

In addition to this danger of losing their land through mining activities, the Papagos because of conditions beyond their control are in dire need of assistance from the Federal Government.

One of the main reasons stems from inadequate educational opportunities. The Papago Reservation at the present time has only 6 Government schools to provide educational opportunities for about 1,250 children. In addition the reservation supports 5 Catholic mission schools offering education to about 350 children, one-half of whom are taken care of by contract with the Federal

Government on a tuition basis. This is necessary since the distances to Government schools are too great, in some instances as high as 20 miles, to allow all of these children to attend even by the use of buses. In addition to this deplorable situation, only the elementary grades are provided. There is no opportunity for these children to further their education on the reservation, in either high school or college, and such opportunities are extremely limited throughout the western United States.

Since 1947, when the hospital at Sells, Ariz., was destroyed by fire, there has been no hospital maintained on the Papago Reservation. The nearest adequate facilities are in Tucson, a distance of 60 miles from the center of the reservation, with the next nearest hospital being located in Phoenix, a distance of 145 miles. Only 2 outpatient clinics, the one at Sells and the other at Santa Rosa, and 1 mobile health unit operated by the United States Public Health Service, are available to care for the entire reservation of about 8,000 population, and these are severely handicapped by a lack of sufficient personnel. There are no obstetrical facilities on the entire reservation, with the result that the infant mortality rate on the Papago Reservation is the worst in the United States with about 1 of every 4 children dying during their first year, and the life expectancy at birth being about 20 years. The health situation is further complicated by the fact that there is no tuberculosis sanatorium on the reservation, and the death rate from this disease is about seven times greater than the average throughout the rest of the United States.

The Papago Indian Reservation is located in an extremely arid region. In spite of this there are only 143 wells serving the entire reservation for an average of less than one well for each village. The water from these few wells is carried for the most part by wagon in barrels for distances up to 5 miles. In some areas water is taken directly from open ponds and used for household purposes without boiling.

Nor does the irrigation problem stand in any better light, for there are only about 15,000 acres, or about one-half of 1 percent of the total acreage lying within the reservation which is irrigable land. This small amount can support only 200 families of the total 1,250 families living on the reservation.

Any one of the above circumstances would of itself be sufficient argument for immediate action by the Federal Government, but with the combination of unfortunate handling of mineral rights, inadequate educational opportunities, nonexistent hospital care and medical guidance, severe lack of water for both household and irrigation purposes, and poor roads, the situation of the Papago Indians is desperate beyond human conception.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully prays:

1. That the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona be closed to any further prospecting or locating of mineral claims, and that the Papago Indian Tribe be granted the same rights to minerals that other Indian tribes on reservations enjoy.

2. That a survey of the mineral resources of the Papago Indian Reservation be made by an agency of the Federal Government.

3. That sufficient funds be appropriated by Congress to create and make effective a comprehensive rehabilitation program to promote the economic and social development of the Papago Indians, such comprehensive program to include: 3 (a) More Government schools and teachers and the opportunity to attend high schools and colleges for Papago children; 3 (b) a 40- to 50-bed general hos-

pital at Sells, Ariz., together with provisions for adequate doctors, dentists, nurses, sanatoriums, mobile health units, ambulances, and administrative assistance to maintain adequate vital statistics; 3 (c) drilling and equipping of more wells both for household and irrigation purposes; 3 (d) more roads, and, 3 (e) in general, to provide facilities, employment, and essential services in combating hunger, disease, poverty, and demoralization among the members of the tribe, to make available the resources of the reservation for use in building up a self-supporting economy and self-reliant communities, and to lay a stable foundation upon which the Papagos can engage in diversified economic activities and ultimately attain standards of living comparable with those enjoyed by other citizens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Whereas the attention of a world plagued with the imperialistic designs of godless communism is focused with foreboding on the next move of the Chinese Communists; and

"Whereas this move could take form in large-scale military aggression aimed at subjugation of Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, and related territory; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has asked the Congress for a grant of authority to employ United States Armed Forces as he sees fit in frustrating a possible Chinese Communist attempt to seize Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, and related territory; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States with but six dissenting votes has given its approval to the subject request, known as the Formosa resolution; and

"Whereas the greatest import of the Formosa resolution stems from its inherent influence as a deterrent to Chinese Communist aggression; and

"Whereas this influence will be felt in direct proportion to the degree of unanimity with which the Formosa resolution is upheld by the citizens of the United States of America and their elected officials, as well as the peoples of all free nations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring), That this 48th legislative assembly, in regular session assembled, hereby give its unequivocal backing to the action taken by the President and the Congress in their advocacy of the Formosa resolution; be it further

"Resolved, That all interested citizens of Oregon and all civil, fraternal, management, labor, veterans, and other organizations in this State hereby be urged likewise to apprise the President and the Congress of their concurrence in the Formosa resolution to the end that as many Americans as possible be united in expressing opposition to Chinese Communist designs on the territory in the western Pacific area in question; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon hereby be directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Oregon delegation to the Congress of the United States of America and to the appropriate representatives of press and radio who can assist in giving the viewpoint

set forth in this resolution the widest possible dissemination.

"Adopted by senate February 3, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,

"Chief Clerk of Senate.

"ELMO E. SMITH,

"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house February 9, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,

"Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Members from Oregon of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior for the United States of America:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas several years ago certain airlines were granted temporary authority by the Civil Aeronautics Board to establish and operate through air freight and passenger transportation service between Portland, Ore., on the one hand, and Alaskan cities upon the other, pending a general investigation known as the States-Alaska case covering the issuance of permanent certificates authorizing such operations; and

"Whereas by reason of this through air transportation service, inaugurated and maintained by these airlines during the past several years, a vital pattern of trade and commerce has been developed as between the industries and businesses of the State of Oregon and the Territory of Alaska, and as a result Oregon industries and businesses are enjoying a rapidly increasing air cargo commerce with industries and businesses in Alaskan cities, while through passenger service is encouraging and building a close tie of friendly business relationship, and thus this service has proved to be an absolute necessity in the public interest; and

"Whereas during 1954 the Civil Aeronautics Board, in the course of their general investigation, caused public hearings to be held respecting the question of adequate air transportation service in the public interest between the United States and the Territory of Alaska, and at these hearings the business interests of the city of Portland and the State of Oregon, supported by the Public Utilities Commissioner of Oregon, intervened in support of a permanently maintained through air transportation service, both air cargo and passenger, between Portland, Ore., and Alaskan cities, while Seattle business interests, supported by the Washington Public Service Commission, took a position favoring a monopoly of Alaskan air commerce by Seattle commercial interests in that they advocated that presently existing through air transportation operations between Portland, Ore., and Alaskan cities should be done away with as uneconomical, and that all temporary airline certificates be rescinded, and that Seattle, Wash., should be permanently designated as the sole and exclusive terminal of all air commerce between the Territory of Alaska and the United States of America; and

"Whereas thereafter an initial decision was proposed by the Chief Hearing Examiner to the Civil Aeronautics Board recommending the granting of the request and contentions of Seattle business and commercial interests by the creation of a virtual monopoly of air trade and commerce in favor of Seattle, and limiting all through air-transportation service between the Territory of Alaska and the United States to the one single air terminal

located in and near Seattle, Wash., and rescinding all temporary certificates held by airlines now serving Portland, Ore., maintaining through air-transportation service between Portland and Alaskan cities, thereby slamming shut the door of trade and commerce between Alaska and the State of Oregon and strangling all competition which is the very essence and life of American commerce, all to the great detriment and loss of not only the businesses, industries, and the people generally of Oregon, but also to the detriment and loss of citizens of the Territory of Alaska and their new and growing industries; and

"Whereas presently existing air trade and commerce between the United States and the Territory of Alaska was found by the Civil Aeronautics Board investigation, through its Chief Hearing Examiner and staff, to be an absolute necessity in the public interest, as shown by the following quoted excerpts from the examiner's report:

"No Territory under the American flag is so dependent upon air transportation as the vast land area of Alaska. The last frontier of the United States contains a vast wealth of natural resources and is so located as to play a vital role in the defense plans of the Nation. Unlike other parts of the United States, there are no alternative modes of transportation in Alaska—the river boats and the dog team have, to a large part, been displaced by the airplane.

"Inadequate, unreliable, and high-cost shipping from the States to Alaska has played a large part in the development of the Territory as an area of high costs, with a consequent deterring effect upon its growth. In addition to the high transportation charges incurred in the transportation of cargo to Alaska, the uncertainties inherent in the system in the past have resulted in the necessity for maintaining unusually high inventories. The problem of spoilage in perishable products has been another problem resulting from the transportation lack. * * * Neither the sea route nor the highway route can offer a reasonably comparable service from standpoint of time, and both of these routings are of limited use during the winter months; and

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that the membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board has finally adopted the detrimental recommendations of the Chief Hearing Examiner, basing their conclusions upon the concept that economy of operations demands a cessation of through air-transportation service between Portland, Ore., and Alaskan cities, even though a strangling monopoly is created and established thereby in favor of Seattle businesses and industries, and despite the apparent fact that the public interest of Oregon will suffer great and irreparable damage while the Territory of Alaska becomes competitively shackled respecting its air trade and commerce with the United States; and

"Whereas if the aforesaid decision becomes the final decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board, all air transportation operations between Portland, Ore., and Alaskan cities will be subject to the additional costs of terminal operations at Seattle, Wash., made necessary by the combination of local flights to Seattle with through flights from thence on to Alaskan cities, which will warrant necessary additional overhead costs of separate organization, separate billing and handling expense on air cargo, and under well recognized court decisions covering rates and charges for transportation, increased rate charges for these additional terminal services are justified, and it is obvious that any proposed shuttle service between Seattle and Portland, and thence by through service to Alaska, on all movements of air cargo, as well as passenger, will entail added rates and

charges which will have the effect of doing away entirely with any competitive aspects of air transportation, trade, and commerce as between Portland and Seattle in relation to the markets and cities of the Territory of Alaska: Be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior be hereby memorialized to bring this most vital transportation and economic situation to the attention of the honorable membership of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, through established procedures, in behalf of the public interest of the people of the State of Oregon, to insure the protection of the public interest in Oregon, as well as the Territory of Alaska, and avert the grave economic consequences which will inevitably follow if an air trade and commerce monopoly is created in favor of the business and commercial interests of Seattle to the exclusion of the commercial and trade interests of the city of Portland, Oreg., by the establishment of through air transportation service as between Seattle, Wash., only, and Alaskan cities, while denying the same through air transportation service between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities, in direct violation of the competitive principles of trade and commerce which is the very essence of the American system and way of life; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, is hereby directed to present official copies of this memorial and resolution, through proper channels, to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior for their consideration and action relative to any decision which might throttle air trade and commerce as between Oregon and the Territory of Alaska, and create a virtual monopoly in behalf of Seattle, Wash., detrimental to the public interest of both the State of Oregon and the Territory of Alaska.

"Adopted by house February 1, 1955.

"Adopted by senate February 11, 1955.

"C. A. GEARY,

"Speaker of the House.

"EDITH BYRON LOW,

"Chief Clerk.

"ELMO E. SMITH,

"President of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF OREGON STATE FARMERS UNION, SALEM, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions, adopted by the Oregon State Farmers Union at Salem, Oreg., relating to income from offshore oil for education, and control and allocation of electric power in the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Whereas there is a movement by the private power utilities to promote the formation of the Columbia Interstate Compact Commission, including the States of Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, and Utah for the purpose of controlling or allocating the electric power in the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas it is feared this commission would be largely in control of the private utilities: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Oregon State Farmers Union go on record as being unalterably opposed to the formation of the so-called Columbia Interstate Compact Commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon delegation in Congress."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolved, That we favor using the Federal income derived from offshore oil for education in accord with the bill introduced by Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress."

COLUMBIA RIVER INTERSTATE COMPACT—RESOLUTION OF OREGON STATE GRANGERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Oregon State Grangers at Portland, Oreg., relating to the Columbia River Interstate Compact.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grangers, representing 34 of the State's 36 counties, meeting at State Grange headquarters in Portland, Oreg., on January 17, 1955, to discuss the hydroelectric power situation in the Pacific Northwest go on record in opposition to the Columbia Interstate Compact between the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Wyoming, and Utah, because this compact would draw arbitrary lines for the allocation of power and water rather than making it available on a regionwide basis.

The wording of the compact is confusing and we urge the Oregon State Legislature not to commit Oregon to this compact when it leaves so many questions unanswered.

We also oppose the compact because it will impede the orderly Federal development of the natural resources and the full hydroelectric power potential of the Pacific Northwest.

RAY W. GILL.

ALBERT ULLMAN.

EARL A. MOORE.

CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS TO CERTAIN NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY CASES—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Oregon, relating to the closing of Veterans hospitals to certain non-service connected cases.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of Portland Chapter No. 1, Disabled American Veterans, that the head of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Higley, has recently issued an order that no non-service connected veteran shall hereafter be admitted to any Veterans Mental Hospital unless his mental or nervous disability shall be directly service connected; and

Whereas it is well known that any veteran afflicted with this disability requires long treatment and hospitalization under such circumstances and few if any of such veterans are financially able to pay for such long time treatment in a private hospital and as a consequence all such veterans will become a public charge to the local branches of the government and the Government is thus shirking and shifting this responsibility of the Government to the local communities who are not financially able to meet this drain upon their treasuries; and

Whereas there are now confined in the State hospitals a large number of veterans who should be receiving this treatment from the Government, in Government institutions and hospitals; and

Whereas the United States Government is gradually shifting this and other responsibilities of the Government to the local communities and thus placing a heavy drain upon the local taxpayers; and

Whereas only a short time ago this same Mr. Higley, head of the Veterans' Administration stated publicly that it was the responsibility of the Government to care for all nonservice connected cases wherein it would require a long period of time for their treatment, which statement is in direct contradiction to the order recently issued; and

Whereas the great cry of the Veterans' Administration as to why they cannot care for these cases is that they do not have sufficient hospital beds for such care; and

Whereas at the present time there is an order out to close the tuberculosis section of the Barnes Veterans Hospital which will make available approximately 150 beds which if properly staffed could be used for mental patients; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Portland Chapter No. 1, DAV, go on record as asking the State legislature to petition or otherwise recommend to Congress and the Veterans' Administration, that the order closing Veteran hospitals to nonservice connected mental or nervous cases be rescinded and that the Congress of the United States be asked to construct or equip and staff additional buildings and hospitals in the northwest to care for such additional patients that are so rapidly adjudged being in need of such care, especially as many of these nonservice cases are borderline cases and in all probability a direct result of the stresses and strains suffered under combat and which are now showing up after a long period of time; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the joint legislative staff of the several veteran organizations and a copy to the State Department of the DAV and to each chapter in the department.

PORTLAND CHAPTER NO. 1, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS.

NATIONAL FLOWER OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Portland (Oreg.) Realty Board, favoring the selection of a national flower of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the board of directors of the Portland Realty Board, in session this

16th day of February of the year 1955, go on record as unanimously approving the movement to select a national flower of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Portland Realty Board hereby recommend that the rose be approved as the flower hereafter to be known as the national flower of the United States of America.

CHARLES L. PAINE,

President, Portland Realty Board.

Attested:

TAYLOR TREECE,

Executive Secretary, Portland Realty Board.

REORGANIZATION OF MILWAUKEE DISTRICT OFFICE, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was delighted to hear from Herbert Schirnas, secretary of the Milwaukee Post of the Society of American Military Engineers, of the desire of that distinguished organization for the retention of the Milwaukee District Office of the Corps of Engineers. Its retention is considered to be vital.

I present this important resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

I earnestly hope that the resolution's objective will indeed be attained.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has announced its plan of reorganization of the Milwaukee district office of the Corps of Engineers and the transfer to the Chicago, Detroit, and St. Paul offices of various responsibilities, duties, and personnel, all in the interest of economy and the attainment of even greater efficiency and value to the public than the high standard always merited by the corps, of which the Milwaukee district office was always a leader; and

Whereas we regret the need of the change in status of the Milwaukee district office, knowing of its long help and value to the port cities on Lake Michigan in both Wisconsin and Michigan, to engineering circles in all classes in both war and peace, and to shipping and economic groups in this powerful industrial and commercial area; and

Whereas we view with great pride the sterling record in the public welfare of the Milwaukee district office, which record is best described by one of our Nation's transportation leaders when he said, "I am amazed at the news that the district office of the Corps of Engineers is closing at Milwaukee. I certainly am sorry for I believe from the time I have known that office it is and has been one of the best engineering offices of the corps and did a great amount of good. It seems to me to be in a proper spot industrially and geographically for the work to be done in that area"; and

Whereas we hold in highest esteem the unmatched technical knowledge and sound judgment of the Corps of Engineers and recognize that the port cities and shipping routes now included in the present Milwaukee district will grow in use beyond estimate to the benefit of the people of both Wisconsin and Michigan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Milwaukee post of the Society of American Military Engineers which in the 25 years of its existence worked with the Milwaukee district office in closest cooperation and highest confidence and es-

teem, express the belief and make the request that the Corps of Engineers continue its long confidence in, and service to, the Lake Michigan area presently in the Milwaukee district, and that the corps will continue in the Milwaukee area office such staff and such facilities as will permit a continuance of the great service and value which in the past won for the Milwaukee district office the high acclaim it received from all our people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the States and districts in the present Milwaukee district, the Chief of Engineers, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the division engineer, north central division, and the district engineer for the Milwaukee district.

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have heard from a great many veterans' organizations in protest against various recommendations which have been filed with the President, and which could result in harming the welfare of the Nation's veterans, particularly those in need of medical care.

I present one such grassroots resolution. It comes from a Veterans of Foreign Wars post in Spooner, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the *RECORD* at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, Spooner, Wis., March 14, 1955.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

HON. JOSEPH MCCARTHY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

HON. ALVIN O'KONSKI,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Our Veterans of Foreign Wars post is very much concerned because of the proposals by the Hoover Commission, and at our last regular meeting the following resolution was unanimously passed:

"Resolved, That Dodge-Gilbertson-Carlson Post 1028, Veterans of Foreign Wars, located at Spooner, Wis., is opposed to the Hoover Commission's proposal to close 21 veterans' hospitals and to curtail the veterans' pensions, for the reason that such proposal would create an undue and unnecessary hardship on all veterans concerned; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution in opposition to such proposal be forwarded to the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator, JOSEPH MCCARTHY, United States Senator, and Hon. ALVIN O'KONSKI, United States Congressman."

We earnestly solicit your concerted opposition to such proposal.

Respectfully,

LLOYD POTTERTON, Commander.
FRED SCHROEDER, Quartermaster.
HERMAN HUMMEL, Adjutant.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY BILLS—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Rev. Leland B. Henry, executive director for the department of Christian social relations, of the diocese of New York, a resolution urging a hearing on pending juvenile delinquency bills, one of which I was glad to cosponsor as a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

I emphatically endorse the recommendation which was made on the occasion of a recent widely attended public conference on our responsibility to troubled children.

I feel sure that hearings will indeed be shortly held by the Senate Labor Committee on this score, and I hope they can be expedited to the greatest possible extent in the interest of starting constructive action on behalf of the Nation's youngsters.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Reverend Mr. Henry be printed in the *RECORD*, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Labor Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

THE COUNCIL OF THE
DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., March 15, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At a conference on our responsibility to our troubled children, sponsored by the department of Christian social relations of the Episcopal diocese of New York, a resolution was unanimously adopted requesting that public hearings be held on two bills dealing with juvenile delinquency, namely, S. 728, introduced by Senator KEFAUVER and 19 other Senators, and S. 894, introduced by yourself and Senator THYE.

The conference numbered 600 people representing 9 dioceses of the Episcopal Church, and 59 voluntary agencies—Jewish, Protestant, and nonsectarian. Among those present were the attorney general of the State of New York, the chairman of the State youth commission, the presiding justice of the Children's Court of New York City and many of the outstanding leaders of the social agencies of New York. A copy of the program is enclosed.

The resolution requesting the hearings was offered by the Right Reverend Charles F. Boynton, suffragan bishop of New York. It was adopted with enthusiasm, and represents the considered judgment of hundreds of concerned, responsible citizens.

Respectfully yours,
LELAND B. HENRY,
Executive Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1166. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended, and section 2 of the act of February 2, 1903, as amended (Rept. No. 114); and

S. 1167. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (Rept. No. 115).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of January 1955 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in

the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JANUARY 1955 AND DECEMBER 1954, AND PAY, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1954

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for January 1955 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In December was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total ¹	2,353,573	2,368,072	-14,499	\$904,338	\$782,372	+\$121,966
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,170,191	1,188,166	-17,975	485,997	403,005	+\$82,992
Department of Defense	1,183,382	1,179,906	+3,476	418,341	379,367	+\$38,974
Inside continental United States	2,126,014	2,141,109	-15,095			
Outside continental United States	227,559	226,963	+596			
Industrial employment	725,396	728,132	-2,736			
Foreign nationals	341,517	340,272	+1,245	26,394	25,133	+\$1,261

¹ Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employ-

ment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954, and pay for December 1954, and comparison with November 1954

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	70,920	70,348	572		24,053	23,424	629	
Commerce ¹	44,466	63,386		18,920	22,579	17,939	4,640	
Health, Education, and Welfare	37,918	36,676	1,242		14,257	13,352	905	
Interior	49,543	49,842		299	19,590	19,019	571	
Justice	30,303	30,249	54		13,806	12,965	841	
Labor	4,891	4,918		27	2,215	2,136	79	
Post Office	507,129	507,928		799	232,031	164,856	67,175	
State	20,825	20,997		172	7,264	6,830	434	
Treasury	80,418	79,181	1,237		33,316	31,369	1,947	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	267	263	4		145	137	8	
Bureau of the Budget	428	430		2	273	257	16	
Council of Economic Advisers	35	34	1		25	23	2	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	68			25	22	3	
National Security Council ⁴	27	26	1		16	16		
Office of Defense Mobilization	292	295		3	152	153		1
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	6		1	3	4		1
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	20	12	8		3	5		2
American Battle Monuments Commission	790	820		30	118	102	16	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,012	5,966	46		2,933	2,932	1	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	582	586		4	269	259	10	
Civil Aeronautics Board	532	533		1	291	279	12	
Civil Service Commission	4,051	4,106		55	1,772	1,698	74	
Commission of Fine Arts ⁵	3	3			1	1		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	65		6	31	27	4	
Defense Transport Administration	17	18		1	11	11		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	135	135			77	73	4	
Farm Credit Administration	1,092	1,087	5		541	518	23	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	698	687	11		363	341	22	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	7	1		5	4	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,088	1,094		6	566	541	25	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,086	1,086		1	486	504		18
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	386	355	1		233	233		
Federal Power Commission	625	636		11	331	322	9	
Federal Trade Commission	591	594		3	328	312	16	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	175	182		7	105	102	3	
Foreign Operations Administration	6,257	6,129	128		2,734	2,601	133	
General Accounting Office	5,771	5,791		20	2,524	2,415	109	
General Services Administration	25,869	25,863	6		8,683	8,341	342	
Government Contract Committee	14	10	4		4	4		
Government Printing Office	6,749	6,781		32	2,883	2,813	70	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,393	10,427		34	4,773	4,624	149	
Indian Claims Commission	14	13	1		10	9	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,822	1,831		9	912	869	43	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission ⁶	2	2						

¹ January figure includes 499 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

² Revised on basis of later information.

³ The Commission of Fine Arts, previously reported under the Interior Department, is now reported as an independent agency. December figures for Interior Department have been adjusted.

⁴ Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

⁵ New agency created pursuant to Public Law 263, 83d Cong.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954, and pay for December 1954, and comparison with November 1954—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Independent Agencies—Continued								
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,188	7,160	28		3,308	3,115	193	
National Capital Housing Authority.....	285	287		2	92	97		5
National Capital Planning Commission.....	21	18	3		10	10		
National Gallery of Art.....	313	315		2	104	98	6	
National Labor Relations Board.....	1,150	1,172		22	623	605	18	
National Mediation Board.....	115	108	7		68	70		2
National Science Foundation.....	178	250		72	88	95		7
National Security Training Commission.....	7	7			5	3	2	
Panama Canal.....	15,638	15,758		120	3,480	2,717	763	
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,445	2,390	55		927	853	74	
Renegotiation Board.....	596	606		10	369	355	14	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.....	21	23		2	15	13	2	
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	18	22		4	11	3	8	
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	691	694		3	397	376	21	
Selective Service System.....	7,146	7,157		11	1,730	1,655	75	
Small Business Administration.....	757	756	1		413	394	19	
Smithsonian Institution.....	633	633			236	226	10	
Soldiers' Home.....	969	976		7	209	193	16	
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	35	35			23	20	3	
Tariff Commission.....	198	195	3		110	107	3	
Tax Court of the United States.....	141	142		1	76	74	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	21,824	22,712		888	10,594	10,746		152
United States Information Agency.....	9,671	9,551	120		2,457	2,335	122	
Veterans' Administration.....	177,806	177,735	71		59,915	56,413	3,502	
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,170,191	1,188,166	3,612	21,587	485,997	403,005	83,180	188
Net change, excluding Department of Defense.....			17,975				82,992	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,920	1,914	6		1,055	1,016	39	
Department of the Army.....	465,470	464,590	880		153,512	126,965	26,547	
Department of the Navy.....	409,520	408,885	635		156,501	149,056	7,445	
Department of the Air Force.....	306,472	304,517	1,955		107,273	102,330	4,943	
Total Department of Defense.....	1,183,382	1,179,906	3,476		418,341	379,367	38,974	
Net increase, Department of Defense.....			3,476				38,974	
Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	2,353,573	2,368,072	7,088	21,587	904,338	782,372	122,154	188
Net change, including Department of Defense.....			14,499				121,966	

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	69,761	69,144	617		Indian Claims Commission.....	14	13	1	
Commerce.....	41,584	60,510		18,926	Interstate Commerce Commission.....	1,822	1,831		9
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	37,392	36,158	1,234		Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission.....	2		2	
Interior.....	43,926	44,216		290	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,188	7,160	28	
Justice.....	29,791	29,735	56		National Capital Housing Authority.....	285	287		2
Labor.....	4,787	4,807		20	National Capital Planning Commission.....	21	18	3	
Post Office.....	504,785	505,584		799	National Gallery of Art.....	313	315		2
State.....	5,835	5,789	46		National Labor Relations Board.....	1,150	1,172		22
Treasury.....	79,429	78,192	1,237		National Mediation Board.....	115	108	7	
Executive Office of the President:					National Science Foundation.....	178	250		72
White House Office.....	267	263	4		National Security Training Commission.....	7	7		
Bureau of the Budget.....	428	430		2	Panama Canal.....	543	551		8
Council of Economic Advisers.....	35	34	1		Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,445	2,390	55	
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	68	68			Renegotiation Board.....	596	606		10
National Security Council.....	27	26	1		Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.....	21	23		2
Office of Defense Mobilization.....	292	295		3	Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	18	22		4
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.....	5	6		1	Securities and Exchange Commission.....	691	694		3
Independent agencies:					Selective Service System.....	6,947	6,958		11
Advisory Committee on Weather Control.....	20	12	8		Small Business Administration.....	757	756	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	18	17	1		Smithsonian Institution.....	631	631		7
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5,996	5,951	45		Soldiers' Home.....	969	976		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	582	586		4	Subversive Activities Control Board.....	35	35		
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	528	529		1	Tariff Commission.....	198	195	3	
Civil Service Commission.....	4,041	4,096		55	Tax Court of the United States.....	141	142		1
Commission of Fine Arts.....	3	3			Tennessee Valley Authority.....	21,824	22,712		888
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	59	65		6	United States Information Agency.....	2,210	2,190	20	
Defense Transport Administration.....	17	18		1	Veterans' Administration.....	176,531	176,476	55	
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	135	135			Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,111,283	1,129,067	3,481	21,265
Farm Credit Administration.....	1,081	1,075	6		Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....			17,784	
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	698	687	11		Department of Defense:				
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	8	7	1		Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,866	1,859	7	
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,061	1,067		6	Department of the Army.....	373,359	373,050	309	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,084	1,085		1	Department of the Navy.....	377,977	377,552	425	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	356	355	1		Department of the Air Force.....	261,529	259,581	1,948	
Federal Power Commission.....	625	636		11	Total, Department of Defense.....	1,014,731	1,012,042	2,689	
Federal Trade Commission.....	591	594		3	Net increase, Department of Defense.....			2,689	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	175	182		7	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	2,126,014	2,141,109	6,170	21,265
Foreign Operations Administration.....	1,651	1,627	24		Net decrease, including Department of Defense.....			15,095	
General Accounting Office.....	5,722	5,742		20					
General Services Administration.....	25,760	25,751	9						
Government Contract Committee.....	14	10	4						
Government Printing Office.....	6,749	6,781		32					
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	10,267	10,302		35					

¹ January figure includes 499 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

² Revised on basis of later information.

³ The Commission of Fine Arts, previously reported under the Interior Department, is now reported as an independent agency. December figures for Interior Department have been adjusted.

⁴ Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

⁵ New agency created pursuant to Public Law 263, 83d Cong.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	1,159	1,204	—	45	Panama Canal.....	15,095	15,207	—	112
Commerce.....	2,882	2,876	6	—	Selective Service System.....	199	199	—	—
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	526	518	8	—	Smithsonian Institution.....	2	2	—	—
Interior.....	5,617	5,626	—	9	United States Information Agency.....	7,461	7,361	100	—
Justice.....	512	514	—	2	Veterans' Administration.....	1,275	1,259	16	—
Labor.....	104	111	—	7	Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	58,908	59,099	237	428
Post Office.....	2,344	2,344	—	—	Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....	—	—	191	—
State.....	14,900	15,208	—	218	Department of Defense:				
Treasury.....	989	989	—	—	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	54	55	—	1
Independent agencies:					Department of the Army.....	92,111	91,540	571	—
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	772	803	—	31	Department of the Navy.....	31,543	31,333	210	—
Atomic Energy Commission.....	16	15	1	—	Department of the Air Force.....	44,943	44,936	7	—
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	4	4	—	—	Total, Department of Defense.....	168,651	167,864	788	1
Civil Service Commission.....	10	10	—	—	Net increase, Department of Defense.....	—	—	787	—
Farm Credit Administration.....	11	12	—	1	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	227,559	226,963	1,025	429
Federal Communications Commission.....	27	27	—	—	Net increase, including Department of Defense.....	—	—	596	—
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1	1	—	—					
Foreign Operations Administration.....	4,606	4,502	104	—					
General Accounting Office.....	49	49	—	—					
General Services Administration.....	109	112	—	3					
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	126	125	1	—					
National Labor Relations Board.....	22	21	1	—					

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1955 and comparison with December 1954

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Department of Defense:				
Agriculture.....	2,778	2,819	—	41	Department of the Army:				
Commerce.....	2,130	2,110	20	—	Inside continental United States.....	1,207,900	1,207,786	114	—
Interior.....	7,755	7,846	—	91	Outside continental United States.....	1,46,900	1,46,707	193	—
Treasury.....	6,473	6,534	—	61	Department of the Navy:				
Independent agencies:					Inside continental United States.....	237,220	236,791	429	—
Atomic Energy Commission.....	135	131	4	—	Outside continental United States.....	6,894	6,922	—	28
Federal Communications Commission.....	14	14	—	—	Department of the Air Force:				
General Services Administration.....	900	868	32	—	Inside continental United States.....	154,418	153,394	1,024	—
Government Printing Office.....	6,749	6,781	—	32	Outside continental United States.....	11,714	15,113	—	3,399
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,188	7,160	28	—	Total, Department of Defense.....	665,046	666,713	1,760	3,427
Panama Canal.....	7,636	7,686	—	50	Net decrease, Department of Defense.....	—	—	1,667	—
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	18,592	19,470	—	878	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	725,396	728,132	1,844	4,580
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	60,350	61,419	84	1,153	Net decrease, including Department of Defense.....	—	—	2,736	—
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....	—	—	1,069	—					

¹ Subject to revision.² Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1955 and comparison with December 1954

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December
Austria.....	171	171	—	—	—	—	171	171
England.....	7,290	7,117	—	—	—	—	7,290	7,117
France.....	20,884	20,274	14,503	14,001	—	—	6,381	6,273
Germany.....	124,804	124,019	101,871	101,551	1,972	1,971	20,961	20,497
Japan.....	157,228	157,581	95,781	95,781	18,543	18,499	42,904	43,304
Korea.....	28,431	28,343	28,431	28,343	—	—	—	—
Lybia.....	1,050	1,077	—	—	—	—	1,050	1,077
Ryukyu.....	223	214	—	—	223	214	—	—
Saudi Arabia.....	698	734	—	—	—	—	698	734
Spain.....	96	95	—	—	—	—	96	95
Trinidad.....	642	644	—	—	642	644	—	—
Total.....	341,517	340,272	240,586	239,676	21,380	21,328	79,551	79,268

¹ Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French, English, Koreans, and Austrians reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,353,573. This was a net decrease of 14,499 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of December.

The decrease resulted largely from the separation of temporary employees of the Census Bureau. Under these circumstances, the regular employment continued the downward trend it had followed for 27 of the past 30 months.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Govern-

ment, by months in fiscal year 1955, which began July 1, 1954, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July.....	2,387,833	—	5,187
August.....	2,375,988	—	11,845
September.....	2,355,170	—	20,818
October.....	2,359,325	4,155	—
November.....	2,385,024	25,699	—
December.....	2,368,072	—	16,952
January.....	2,353,573	—	14,499

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of January was 1,170,191,

a decrease of 17,975, compared with the December total of 1,188,166. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,183,382. This was a net increase of 3,476, as compared with 1,179,906 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting the major decreases were: Department of Commerce, with a decrease of 18,920; Tennessee Valley Authority, with a decrease of 888; and the Post Office Department, with a decrease of 799. Major increases were reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with an increase of 1,242; Department of the Treasury, with an increase of 1,237;

and the Department of Agriculture, with an increase of 572.

Increases in civilian employment by the Department of Defense were reported by Department of the Air Force, with an increase of 1,955; Department of the Army, with an increase of 880; Department of the Navy, with an increase of 635; and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with an increase of 6.

Inside continental United States civilian employment decreased 15,095, and outside continental United States civilian employment increased 596.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in January totaled 725,396, a decrease of 2,736 as compared with December.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,353,573 civilian employees certified to the committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but, in addition to these, there were 341,517 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of January who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in December was 340,272. A breakdown of this employment for January follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria.....	171			171
England.....	7,290			7,290
France.....	20,884	14,503		6,381
Germany.....	124,804	101,871	1,972	20,961
Japan.....	157,228	95,781	18,543	42,904
Korea.....	28,431	28,431		
Lybia.....	1,050			1,050
Ryukyu.....	223		223	
Saudi Arabia.....	698			698
Spain.....	96			96
Trinidad.....	642		642	
Total.....	341,517	240,586	21,380	79,551

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Mr. Irfan Kavar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rosemary Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the amount of income tax payable in the case of an individual 65 years of age or over who sells his home and does not acquire a new one; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1486. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c);

S. 1487. A bill relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations;

S. 1488. A bill relating to the payment of money orders;

S. 1489. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; and

S. 1490. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1491. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1492. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1493. A bill for the relief of Dorin Ursulesku Baron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1494. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the village of Central, in the State of New Mexico, certain lands administered by the Veterans' Administration facility at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1495. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the making of facsimile reproductions of certain naturalization and citizenship papers having historical value; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1496. A bill for the relief of Ruriko Hara; and

S. 1497. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1498. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1499. A bill to provide that school districts which filed applications for payments under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, before November 24, 1953, shall not be penalized on account of school-construction contracts made after that date; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1500. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUSH,

Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BENDER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. IVES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1501. A bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 1502. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, to require

public hearings prior to withdrawals of all public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Harold George Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Yee Loy Foo, also known as Loy Foo Yee, or Ted Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 1505. A bill to increase the salaries of teachers of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1506. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special stamp commemorative of the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in conservation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills providing pay increases for postal and classified Federal employees.

The bill providing pay increases for postal employees provides for an average of 7½-percent pay increase. The bill carries an overall 6-percent increase with a 1½-percent increase based on reclassification. The bill for classified employees carries a 6 percent across-the-board pay increase.

When the proposed legislation for a pay increase for both of these groups is before the Senate, I expect to offer them as substitutes for the bills submitted by the majority of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 1489. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

S. 1490. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government.

GOLD REDEMPTION ACT OF 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, entitled "The Gold Redemption Act of 1955." It merely reestablishes for our citizens a privilege we already grant to foreigners. The United States Treasury accords to foreign central banks the privilege of obtaining gold in exchange for dollars at the rate of 1 troy ounce of gold for \$35. My bill extends to Americans no more than the same rights accorded foreign interests. It removes an unfair discrimination against United

States citizens in favor of foreign central bankers.

During 1953, and down to June 1954, \$1,247,000,000 in gold, at \$35 an ounce, was transferred to foreign interests from our Treasury in exchange for dollars. There is no justice or economic sense in denying to United States citizens what we freely grant to foreign interests. Since January 31, 1934, we have made good in gold for dollars at that rate to foreign central banks with whose countries we were at peace. Is the Government of these United States at war with its own citizens? Then, why not treat them as well, at least, as we do foreign interests who may wish to exchange dollars for gold? Especially is that a minimum of justice to American citizens whose efforts cause the gold to come into the Treasury in exchange for the products of their toil and risk taking.

Twenty-two years ago we suspended specie payments in gold for American citizens. The then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Woodin, was reported in the New York Times and in other newspapers as saying that the suspension was for the time being and to meet an emergency. It followed the advice of J. M. Keynes—Lord Keynes of England. Whether there was an emergency in 1933 is doubtful, because there was more gold in the Treasury on January 1, 1933, than there was in the Treasury in September 1929. But those were days when many doubtful and in fact unconstitutional remedies were the fashion. That experiment of tinkering with the standard was abandoned January 31, 1934, with the dollar fixed at 35 to the ounce. It was followed by the NRA, which was declared unconstitutional and also abandoned. The President's right to further devalue the dollar expired in 1943, and, after review by the Senate, was not extended, but we had not put things in the rightful posture in regard to the first experiment which had been abandoned. We left the American citizen denuded of a right to redeem his dollar currency as well as any foreign interest. My bill clears up that uncertainty.

This bill is the same as that on which hearings were held by the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate in the last session, from March 29 through April 1. Consideration was given to the fact that \$11 billion was held by foreign governments or central banks, or national banks, and private owners as well. However, when already swimming one does not fear that a shower may make one wet. We redeem the dollars of foreign interests in gold now, and my bill proposes no change in that. Foreign holders of obligations in dollars would be no more inclined nor no more able to draw an undue amount of gold after the enactment of my bill than before. In fact, it seems more likely that foreigners would be pleased to continue their investments in dollars in a country which unfailingly redeemed its currency to all holders of it, whether foreigners or citizens.

Irresponsible talk about devaluing the dollar is dangerous to stability. It would precipitate the very drain which critics of my bill say they fear. That is because any foreign central bank having any

suspicion that the dollar would bring a lesser weight of gold than one thirty-fifth of an ounce, at some future date would be inclined to withdraw gold and remove it from our country. The enactment of my bill with the actual coinage of gold and offer of it for circulation among our own people is earnest of our intention to maintain the fixed standard of value hereafter.

Easy money does not make good times; in fact, quite the contrary. In 1939 we had 11 million unemployed, although we had been taken off the gold standard for our own people since 1933. We enacted the bill resuming specie payments after the experience of the depression of 1873. It ushered in the period beginning in 1879 known on economists' charts as the era of gold standard prosperity.

Nor does easy money assist in financing the public debt among buyers of long-term bonds. The certainty of payment in a fixed standard would, on the contrary, improve the saleability of bonds, and assist the Treasury in placing them with real savers, instead of being compelled to issue short-term notes bought chiefly by banks to work the engine of inflation.

The gold standard is no panacea. Its proponents do not claim that it will make prices higher, or lower; they do not say that it will save us from follies, of unwise speculation of itself; nor will it automatically balance the budget, although it will give us a measure of value which will permit us to see why we must do so in the long run.

The bill carries out the pledge to the American people in the Republican platform. It carries out the principles of many of the more responsible members of the Democratic Party. It is in the American tradition. All dollars are equal under my bill, because all are convertible on demand into our standard of value, gold at \$35 to the ounce. The dollar of the American citizen will be as good as a dollar held by foreign interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1491) to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRANSFER OF CASES BETWEEN DISTRICT COURTS AND COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims.

At the present time, contract suits against the United States involving maritime matters may be brought either in the Court of Claims under the Tucker Act, or in the United States district courts in admiralty under the Suits in Admiralty Act or Public Vessels Act, depending upon whether the vessel was

operated by or for the Government, as a public vessel, etc. A number of court decisions have been rendered over the past several years which are not entirely in harmony, and maritime litigants have frequently, because of complex factors and determinations involved, commenced suit in a court which is ultimately determined to be without jurisdiction. Thus, litigants having meritorious claims have commenced litigation in the wrong forum, and then, after the statute of limitations has run, have been barred from suit in the proper forum. Section 1500 of title 28 prohibits bringing suits concurrently in the Court of Claims and district courts.

The proposed legislation provides that if a case is brought in the district court in admiralty, and it later develops that it should have originally been brought in the Court of Claims under the Tucker Act, the case may then be transferred to the Court of Claims. The statute of limitations would be determined by the date of filing in the original court. Similarly, if a case were filed erroneously in the Court of Claims, then the case might ultimately be transferred to the district court in admiralty, the filing date in the Court of Claims being the determining date for purposes of determining the statute of limitations. Thus, a meritorious cause of action would not be barred if counsel should make an erroneous determination as to whether the vessel involved in the litigation was employed as a merchant vessel, or was a public vessel, or whether a contract with the United States was maritime or nonmaritime.

The proposed legislation is endorsed by the Maritime Law Association of the United States, and a companion bill (H. R. 668) is pending in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1497) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED ARMED SERVICES HOUSING INSURANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services.

The so-called Wherry Act, the Military Housing Act, will expire on June 30. Therefore, it will be necessary for Congress to enact new legislation if any housing is to be provided for our military personnel. The bill which I am introducing is, I believe, superior to the Wherry Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement and a memorandum, prepared by me, explaining the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1501) to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Armed Services Housing Insurance Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. The National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE X—ARMED SERVICES HOUSING INSURANCE

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 1001. The purpose of this title is to assist in relieving the acute shortage of housing accommodations that now exists on military installations and to increase the supply of necessary housing accommodations for military personnel at such installations. To effectuate this purpose, the Commissioner shall, upon application of the mortgagee, insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided, and, make commitments for so insuring such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liability outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed \$1,350,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 1002. To be eligible for insurance under this title, a mortgage shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgaged property shall be designed for use for residential purposes by military personnel of the armed services and situated at or near a military installation. No mortgage shall be insured under this

title unless the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or their designees, shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing with respect to which the mortgage is made is necessary to provide public quarters at such military installation and that there is no present intention to curtail substantially the activities at such installation. The certification shall be accepted by the Federal Housing Commissioner as conclusive evidence of the necessity of providing public quarters for such military installation.

"(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount:

"(A) Not to exceed the amount which an eligible builder (as defined in section 3 of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Act of 1955) has bid to construct the housing project; and

"(B) Not to exceed an average of \$13,500 per family unit for such part of the property as may be attributable to dwelling use.

"AMORTIZATION AND INTEREST

"SEC. 1003. The mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payments over a period of not to exceed 25 years and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time. The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"PREMIUM

"SEC. 1004. For insurance granted pursuant to this title, the Commissioner shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the mortgagee, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Commissioner under this title at par plus accrued interest. Upon presentation of a mortgage for insurance that complies with the provisions of this title and tender of the initial premium charge, such mortgage shall be accepted for insurance by endorsement or otherwise as the Commissioner may prescribe. In insuring mortgages under this section, the Commissioner is authorized to waive his usual requirement for property and hazard insurance. In the event the principal obligation of any mortgage accepted for insurance under this title is paid in full prior to the maturity date, the Commissioner is authorized to refund to the mortgagee for the account of the mortgagor all, or such portion as he shall determine to be equitable, of the current unearned premium charge theretofore paid.

"DEFAULT

"SEC. 1005. (a) The failure of the mortgagor to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of a mortgage insured under this title shall be considered a default under such mortgage and, if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon assignment, transfer, and delivery to the Commissioner, within a period and in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of:

"(1) All rights and interest arising under the mortgage in default;

"(2) All claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagors or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction;

"(3) All policies of title or other insurance or surety bonds or other guarantees and any and all claims thereunder;

"(4) Any balance of the mortgage loan not advanced to the mortgagor;

"(5) Any cash or property held by the mortgagee, or to which it is entitled, as deposits made for the account of the mortgagor and which have not been applied in reduction of the principal of the mortgage indebtedness; and

"(6) All records, documents, books, papers, and accounts relating to the mortgage transaction.

"(b) Upon such assignment, transfer, and delivery, the obligation of the mortgagee to pay the premium charge for mortgage insurance shall cease, and the Commissioner shall, subject to the cash adjustment provided for in section 1006 of this title, issue to the mortgagee debentures having a total face value equal to the value of the mortgage, and a certificate of claim as hereinafter provided.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the value of the mortgage shall be determined in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, by adding to the amount of the original principal obligation of the mortgage which was unpaid on the date of default, the amount the mortgagee may have paid for:

"(1) Any liens that are prior to the mortgage, including special assessments, water rates or taxes when applicable.

"(2) Insurance on the property; and

"(3) Reasonable expenses for the completion and preservation of the property and any mortgage insurance premiums paid after default; less the sum of:

"(A) Any amount received on account of the mortgage after such date; and

"(B) Any net income received by the mortgagee from the property after such date: *Provided*, That the mortgagee in the event of a default under the mortgage may, at its option and in accordance with regulations of, and in a period to be determined by, the Commissioner, proceed to foreclose on and obtain possession of or otherwise acquire such property from the mortgagor after default, and receive the benefits of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon:

"(1) the prompt conveyance to the Commissioner of the mortgagee's interest in the property which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Commissioner in force at the time the mortgage was insured, and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations; and

"(2) the assignment to him of all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction or foreclosure proceedings, except such claims that may have been released with the consent of the Commissioner. Upon such conveyance and assignment, the obligation of the mortgagee to pay the premium charge for insurance shall cease and the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as provided in this section.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 1006. (a). Debentures issued under this title shall be in such form and denominations in multiples of \$50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall include such provisions for redemption, if any, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be in coupon or registered form. Any difference between the value of the mortgage determined as herein provided and the aggregate face value of the debentures issued, not to exceed \$50, shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Commissioner to the mortgagee from the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"(b) Debentures issued under this title shall be executed in the name of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Commissioner, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. All such debentures shall be dated as of the date of default as determined in accordance with section 1005

of this title, and shall bear interest from such date at a rate determined by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the mortgage was accepted for insurance, but not to exceed 3 percent per annum, payable semi-annually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature 10 years after the date thereof.

"(c) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed, by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. They shall be paid out of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund which shall be primarily liable therefor, and they shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face of the debentures. In the event the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal or interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holder of such debentures.

"CERTIFICATE OF CLAIM

"SEC. 1007. The certificate of claim issued by the Commissioner to any mortgagee in connection with the insurance of mortgages under this title shall be for an amount determined in accordance with subsections (e) and (f) of section 604 of this act, except that any amount remaining after the payment of the full amount under the certificate of claim shall be retained by the Commissioner and credited to the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 1008 (a). There is hereby created the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for payment of his administrative expenses in connection therewith. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Commissioner such funds as the Commissioner shall deem necessary, but not to exceed \$10 million, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. For immediate needs pending such appropriation, the Commissioner is directed to transfer the sum of \$1 million to such fund from the War Housing Insurance Fund created by section 602 of this act, as amended, such amount to be reimbursed to the War Housing Insurance Fund upon the availability of the appropriations authorized by this section. General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration under this title may be charged to the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"(b) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees, received on account of the insurance of any mortgage insured under this title, the receipts derived from any such mortgage or claim assigned to the Commissioner and any property acquired by the Commissioner under this title, and all earnings on the assets of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund, shall be credited to such fund. The principal of and interest paid and to be paid on debentures issued in exchange for any mortgage or property insured under this title, cash adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling of such mortgages or property and in the foreclosure and collection of mortgages and claims assigned to the Commissioner under this title, shall be

charged to the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"(c) Moneys in the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of such fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"CONTRACT OF INSURANCE CONCLUSIVE

"SEC. 1009. Any contract of insurance executed by the Commissioner under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such approved mortgagee.

"SECONDARY MARKET

"SEC. 1010. In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages insured under this title, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereinafter established, to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with mortgages insured under this title.

"POWER TO INSURE UNDER OTHER TITLES

"SEC. 1011. The Commissioner shall also have power to insure under this title or titles II or VI any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under this title without regard to any limit as to eligibility, time or aggregate amount contained in this title or titles II or VI.

"APPLICABILITY OF OTHER SECTIONS OF ACT

"SEC. 1012. The provisions of section 207 (k) and section 207 (l) of this act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this title and to property acquired by the Commissioner hereunder, except that as applied to such mortgages and property:

"(1) All references in such sections to the 'Housing Fund' shall be construed to refer to the 'Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund,' and

"(2) The reference in section 207 (k) to 'subsection (g)' shall be construed to refer to 'section 1003' of this title.

"INAPPLICABILITY OF PROVISION IN SECTION 214

"SEC. 1013. The second sentence of section 214 of this act, as amended, relating to housing in the Territory of Alaska, shall not apply to mortgages insured under this title on property in said Territory.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 1014. The Commissioner may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISION

"SEC. 1015. Section 1 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out 'Titles II, III, VI, VII, VIII, and IX' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'Titles II, III, VI, VII, VIII, IX and X'.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1016. The following terms shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them below:

"(a) 'Mortgage' means a first mortgage on real estate held in fee simple or under a lease.

"(b) 'First mortgage' means such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure

advances on or the unpaid purchase price of real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby.

"(c) 'Mortgagee' includes the original lender under a mortgage and his successors and assigns approved by the Commissioner.

"(d) 'Mortgagor' includes the original borrower under a mortgage, its successors and assigns (including the United States acting through the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force or their respective designees, and its assigns).

"(e) 'Maturity date' means the date on which the mortgage indebtedness would be extinguished if paid in accordance with periodic payments provided for in the mortgage.

"(f) 'Housing accommodations' means housing designed for use by Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps personnel, and their dependents, assigned to duty at the military installation at or in the area where such property is constructed.

"(g) 'Military' includes Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

"(h) 'State' includes the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Guam."

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized to enter into contracts with any eligible builder to provide for the construction of urgently needed housing on lands owned or leased by the United States and situated on or near a military reservation or installation for the purpose of providing suitable living accommodations for military personnel of the armed services assigned to duty at the military installation at or in the area where the housing is situated. Any such contract shall contain such terms and conditions, including the amount of the mortgage that the Commissioner shall insure, as the Secretary may determine to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States. The terms and conditions of such contract shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner that the contractor is an eligible builder within the meaning of this act and that the amount set forth in the contract as to the cost of the housing is the amount that shall be insured.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to acquire by lease or otherwise, the housing constructed pursuant to such contracts; to maintain and operate such housing; to assume the payment of notes, mortgages, or other legal instruments required by the Federal Housing Commissioner of the owners or mortgagors or prospective owners or mortgagors constructing housing projects insured under title X of the National Housing Act, and to make amortization payments thereon; but, all rental or other payments made during any year in the case of any housing so acquired shall not exceed an average living unit payment of \$90 per month, and, in the case of any one of the military departments total payments per month for all housing so acquired, shall not exceed \$9 million per month.

(c) For the purposes of this act, the term "eligible builder" means a person, partnership, firm or corporation determined by the Secretary (1) to be qualified by experience and financial responsibility to construct housing of the type described in subsection (a) of this section, and (2) to have submitted the lowest acceptable bid as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

(d) Before the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force shall enter into any contract with any builder as provided in this section for the construction of any housing he shall invite the submission of competitive bids after advertising in the manner pre-

scribed in section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

Sec. 4. Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force shall deem it necessary for the purposes of this act, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings to acquire by condemnation, any unimproved land adjacent to a military reservation or installation. Any such condemnation proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before condemnation proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation unless, because of reasonable doubt as to the identity of the owner or owners, because of the large number of persons with whom it would be necessary to negotiate, or for other reasons, the effort to acquire by negotiation would involve, in the judgment of the Secretary, such delay in acquiring the property as to be contrary to the interest of national defense. In any condemnation proceeding instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 percent of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

Sec. 5. Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force determines that it is necessary to lease any land held by the United States on or near a military reservation or installation to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may lease such land upon such terms and conditions as will, in his opinion, best serve the national interest.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force or their designees are authorized to assign quarters in any housing acquired under this act to military personnel in the same manner and to the same extent as other public quarters are so assigned.

Sec. 7. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized, upon a determination that such action is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, to procure by negotiation or otherwise the services of experts and consultants (including architects and engineers), or organizations thereof under such arrangements as they may deem desirable without regard to the civil service and classification laws, to compensate any individuals so procured at rates not in excess of \$50 per day, and to pay travel expenses of such individuals, including actual transportation costs and per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence while traveling to and from their respective homes or places of business and the official duty station as may be authorized in travel orders or letters of appointment. Such services may include the development of plans, drawings, and specifications for housing and related facilities under the authority of this act and for other services in connection therewith, including inspection of construction.

(b) The procurement of services in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section may include provisions for advances or progress payments, for payment by

third parties, for payment by the Government of any such compensation as is not paid for by third parties. Provision may be made for reimbursement by third parties or from mortgage funds to the Government pursuant to this section, and other provisions may be made for compensation. All reimbursement paid to the Government on account of payments made pursuant to this section, or other sections of this act, shall be credited to the appropriations or funds against which such payments were charged. Any public-works appropriations now or hereafter available to the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may be obligated by the respective Department for these purposes.

Sec. 8. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 3 through 7 of this act.

(b) Any funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be expended by any of the military departments for the payment of allowances for quarters for military personnel may be used for the purposes specified in subsection (a) above.

The statement and memorandum, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

By a record vote of 399 to 1, the House approved last Thursday, March 10, 1955, an incentive-pay increase for nearly 2 million career men and women in the armed services ranging from 6 percent to 25 percent. This pay increase certainly is deserved and appropriate.

Another great military necessity exists. There is an alarmingly acute shortage of housing accommodations for military personnel and their families. This possibly constitutes the greatest need today of all branches of the armed services.

At present about 80 percent of the officers and about 20 percent of the enlisted personnel are married and are in the three top pay grades. Under existing permanent legislation, these personnel are entitled to Government quarters or rental allowances in lieu thereof. The requirement for housing on the basis of this permanent legislation is 140,000 units for officers and 315,000 units for enlisted men, making a total of 455,000 units for a permanent peacetime strength of 1,750,000 men. At present there are nearly 3 million men in the various services.

To meet the housing requirement presently for these people, the services have only 124,000 permanent units of family housing, plus 100,000 units of temporary housing (25,000 only of which are in good condition), and an estimated community support of 150,000 units. This leaves an estimated deficiency of at least 150,000 housing units needed now, and badly, by the permanent Military Establishment.

The lower four grades are likewise entitled to Government quarters or rental allowances in lieu thereof by temporary legislation expiring on June 30 of this year. It is believed, however, that the Congress may be asked to make this legislation permanent. Twenty percent of this personnel likewise are married. To provide housing for them would require approximately 300,000 additional units. However, since the legislation is not permanent, these personnel have not been included in the above calculations.

Experience convinces us that a happy wife and a happy family mean a more happy, a more satisfied, a more efficient serviceman.

I am convinced that a solution to the present inadequate housing for service personnel is both in the best interest of our national defense and of our taxpayers. Too seldom in this day and age of the A-bomb and the H-bomb and the highly complicated and intricate mechanized equipment do we

consider either the time or the money required to train men and women in the arts of present day technical warfare.

It is estimated today that to train 1 pilot for our modern airplanes costs \$40,000 or more. To train 1 enlisted technician to service our airplanes and their equipment costs about \$14,000 and requires a period of 28 months out of the 4-year enlistment period.

Now let us consider reenlistments by Regulars in all branches of the service. For the period July 1 to December 31, 1954, 76 percent of the Regulars in all branches did not reenlist—a truly appalling fact considering the waste both in manpower and in money.

It has been estimated that in order to maintain a reasonably well-trained Military Establishment, at least 33 percent of the Regulars should reenlist instead of the present 24 percent. For every 1 percent that reenlistments are raised, the Air Force alone estimates that \$20,400,000 is saved. Moreover, and of much greater significance, is the fact that for every percent the reenlistment of Regulars is raised, a combat team with more efficient operations is saved and maintained.

I firmly believe that if we provide the housing we should provide, we will find that reenlistments meet the expectation and the need. It is for this reason that I am today, joined by many Members of this body, introducing a bill which I believe will go far toward solving the housing problem for the armed services.

Many Senators, upon hearing of my proposal, have asked to join as cosponsors. In view of the very widespread interest in this bill on both sides of the aisle, I am asking that it lay on the table for 3 days so that others of my colleagues who wish to do so may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

MEMORANDUM IN EXPLANATION OF S. 1501

A draft of a bill to provide urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services and their families is attached.

I took the "best of Wherry," eliminating those provisions which are said to have constituted roadblocks to obtaining this needed housing, and added needed new features.

The FHA mortgage insurance feature is utilized with the establishment of a separate fund to be known as the "Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund."

Under Wherry, it is necessary to have a sponsor, a builder, and someone to maintain and operate the project upon completion of construction. All three of these functions frequently were performed by the same person but not necessarily so.

The attached bill dispenses with the need for an outside sponsor and for outside maintenance and operation after construction.

A sponsor, as such, is not needed. Insofar as the functions formerly performed by a sponsor are concerned, these are performed by the branch of the service interested and the builder.

Maintenance after construction is by the interested service. By eliminating maintenance and operation cost, we have estimated that a billion dollars could have been saved with respect to the 80,000 Wherry units now built or in process.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF BILL

New title X—"Armed Services Housing Insurance," an amendment to the National Housing Act.

Insurance mandatory

When the appropriate Secretary certifies to the Commissioner of FHA that (1) the housing with respect to which the mortgage is made is necessary; and (2) no present intention exists to curtail substantially the

activities of such installation, the Commissioner of FHA must grant insurance on the mortgage in an amount not to exceed—

(a) The amount of the lowest acceptable responsible bid as established by competitive-bid procedure in accordance with section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

(b) An average of \$13,500 per family unit. Comment: This provision eliminates the discretion of FHA, presently existing administratively under the Wherry Act, to approve or disapprove the granting of mortgage insurance, depending upon whether FHA thought the proposal was economically sound or the units were needed at the installation in question.

The responsible military authority should know better than anyone else what is required. A careful check by the "watchdog committee" of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee could and should be kept to the end that the military does not abuse this newly granted authority.

In reducing the responsibility of FHA, it is anticipated that processing time will be cut in half. The average processing time under the Wherry Act before a spade of dirt is turned is about 13 months. Construction is not completed for at least another year.

Although the matter has not been explored with FHA, I rather suspect that the Commissioner might not be too unhappy to be relieved of the above-discussed responsibility.

It is intended and I believe that since the builder is purely and simply a builder neither mortgaging out nor the reaping of windfall profits are possible.

The lowest financially responsible bidder will be awarded each contract. Naturally, included in the bid is what he hopes will be his profit. This, however, is not repulsive but is in the best American tradition. Exercise of diligence by the military services will make excessive profits unlikely at least, if not impossible.

The cost must not exceed an average of \$13,500 per family unit. This amount is neither the maximum nor the minimum. The reason for this flexibility is obvious. A serviceman with a monthly quarters allowance of \$90 should not receive the same type quarters as one with a monthly quarters allowance of \$170.

Presently, under the Wherry Act, the average living space is about 865 square feet. Under this bill, using the amount suggested, it is thought that a minimum of 1,080 and a maximum of nearly 1,400 square feet of living space can be obtained, with a few units for flag or general officers that may approach 2,100 square feet.

Amortization and interest

The mortgage must provide for complete amortization over a period of not to exceed 25 years at a rate of interest of not to exceed 4 percent.

Comment: It is estimated variously that amortization is readily possible in from 18 to 25 years, utilizing the quarters' allowances granted the military occupant.

It is believed that private capital will be interested at a rate of interest of about 3½ percent, which is the same percentage now paid to finance the college dormitory construction under the Housing Act.

Insurance premium

A premium charge of not to exceed one-half of 1 percent, to be fixed by the Commissioner, must be paid by the mortgagee for the insurance granted.

Comment: Under Wherry, discretion is in the Commissioner to fix the premium charge at anywhere between one-half of 1 percent and 1½ percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year.

I believe that a maximum premium of one-half of 1 percent is adequate under this bill. By making the premium relatively low,

I hope that the mortgages will thereby become more attractive to private capital.

Default

In the event of a default that continues for 30 days, the mortgagee may receive the benefits of the insurance provided under the bill by proceeding in 1 of 2 ways:

1. Assign, transfer, and deliver to the Commissioner all of his right, title, and interest in the mortgage. Thereupon, premium charges for insurance shall cease and the Commissioner shall proceed to issue debentures to the mortgagee having a face value equal to the value of the mortgage, subject to cash adjustments.

2. Foreclose and obtain possession of the property, conveying the mortgagee's interest to the Commissioner and assigning all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor to the Commissioner. Thereupon, the mortgagee is entitled to receive mortgage debentures in the face amount of the insurance, subject to cash adjustments.

Comment: These provisions follow substantially the already well-established pattern in the law with respect to FHA mortgage insurance.

Debentures

Debentures may be issued in the name of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund as obligor in such form and denominations in multiples of \$50, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such debentures shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum, as determined by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, bearing date as of the date of default. They mature 10 years from date.

These debentures are exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation, except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes. Payment of the debentures, in the first instance, is out of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund which is primarily liable. In the event such fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the Secretary of the Treasury must honor the debentures. This means that the debentures are fully and unconditionally guaranteed by the United States.

Comment: In order to interest private capital, it appears essential that either the full faith and credit of the United States or a guaranty of the United States be behind all debentures issued by the Commissioner in payment to the mortgagee in the event of default.

I have been informed that this matter has been explored fully and thoroughly with the big insurance companies and others on several occasions and that they insist on one or the other requirement.

The guaranty method has been utilized for several reasons, principally because its operation is well known and understood.

It is my understanding that until there is a default and an issue of debentures to pay the mortgagee, any obligation resulting from the issuance of insurance on mortgages under the bill is no more than a contingent liability of the United States, and consequently, could not affect the national debt limit.

In case of default and the issuance of debentures, it is my understanding that for the first time a direct obligation exists against the United States which could affect the debt limit.

It is anticipated that the insurance fund will be adequate to pay in the event of any default. Actually, there would seem to be little likelihood of any mortgage going into default. Virtually the only possibility would appear to be when the installation is abandoned by the interested military service.

The military would assign its personnel to quarters in these units just as it otherwise assigns public quarters. This means that the quarters' allowances, whether they be \$90—

the average monthly quarters' allowance—or \$170—the monthly quarters' allowance for general officers—will be withheld from the assigned personnel and used to make periodic payments on the principal and interest of the mortgages outstanding against the respective housing accommodations.

Insurance fund

The bill creates the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund, which is similar to the Military Housing Insurance Fund under Wherry.

Authorization is given the Secretary of the Treasury to make available immediately for the use of the fund the sum of \$10 million. Immediate transfer of \$1 million from the War Housing Insurance Fund is directed in order that general expenses and operations may be paid prior to the transfer of the \$10 million.

Premium charges are earmarked for the fund.

Comment: The procedure here utilized is similar to that which was used to establish the insurance fund under Wherry.

Secondary mortgage market

In order to assure an adequate market, FNMA is specifically authorized to purchase, service, and sell.

The following is with reference to sections 3 through 8 of the bill. These sections are not amendments to the Housing Act, but deal rather with providing adequate authority in the Secretaries of the armed services to utilize the provisions under new title X of the Housing Act.

Authorities in the Secretaries

The Secretaries are authorized to acquire by purchase, by lease, or by condemnation—similar to provision as set forth in Defense Production Act of 1950—real estate needed to effectuate the purposes of the bill.

The appropriate Secretary is also authorized to enter into contracts with any eligible bidder for the construction of housing for occupancy by military personnel of the armed services. Specifically, the competitive bid procedure as provided for in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, must be followed, with plans and specifications to be developed by the military departments.

An "eligible bidder" is defined as a person, partnership, firm, or corporation qualified by experience and financial responsibility to construct the housing required and who has submitted the lowest acceptable bid.

Authority is given the appropriate Secretary to lease any land held by the United States to an eligible bidder and also to assign quarters to military personnel, withholding therefrom the quarters' allowances of the personnel so assigned.

The aggregate amount of contingent liability outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure cannot exceed \$1,350,000,000. This ceiling makes a potential of 100,000 units available before further fund authorization need be sought of the Congress. This is calculated on the basis of an average per unit payment of \$90 per month with a total payment per month by any one branch of the military not to exceed \$9 million.

Comment: It appears appropriate and necessary to grant the Secretaries of the various services rather flexible authority in order to permit them to effectively implement the act. Such has been done. Administrative rules and regulations under the act will be promulgated by the military services and FHA.

In the past it has been found to be both unwise and virtually impossible to write rules and regulations into statutes. These properly should be handled administratively by the issuance of appropriate rules and regulations.

In some situations it may be necessary for the military service involved to acquire additional land for the reason that sufficient

space is not presently available on the reservation or base. Authority to do so is provided. Cost of such acquisition can be included in the average unit cost of \$13,500.

An accelerated condemnation procedure is included in the bill. This is similar to the provision found in the Defense Production Act of 1950. It was utilized because it appears that time is of the essence.

Competitive bidding is one of the key features of the bill. It will be governed by section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. An "eligible bidder" is defined in a manner that follows the recognized definition used in such Procurement Act.

Specific authority is given the appropriate Secretary to lease to the successful bidder the real estate on which the units are to be constructed. This is done in order to provide a further tool, which may be needed to obtain private financing of the housing.

It is expected that the military and/or FHA will issue rules and regulations covering the terms and conditions to be included in the contract entered into between the military service involved and the successful bidder.

I would expect also that the successful bidder will be required by regulation to form a construction corporation, with the common stock to be issued to the bidder and the preferred stock to be held by FHA.

The construction contract would be entered into between the military and the builder corporation. Very likely, in order to aid in obtaining private financing the military would lease to the construction corporation the real estate on which the units are to be constructed.

Armed with the construction contract and with a lease in excess of 25 years (probably 50 years to meet FNMA requirements), the construction corporation would go to FHA for an insurance commitment, without additional processing. Upon receipt of an insurance commitment from FHA, the construction corporation would seem to have adequate collateral to obtain funds in the amount of the bid price, payable probably as the work proceeds, from private lending institutions.

The construction corporation would continue in existence until the mortgage is retired. The common stock of the corporation, however, would be transferred and delivered to the respective Secretary where it could be held until full payment of the mortgage is made. Thereafter, the corporation would be dissolved by the military department, thus merging the lease in the fee.

To simplify bookkeeping the military probably would want and could get the construction corporation to assign to the mortgagee all of its right, title, and interest in and to the quarters' allowance payments allocated to the mortgaged premises. If so, payments on the mortgage could then be made direct to the mortgagee.

CONCLUSION

The sole purpose of this legislation is to make available the tools whereby necessary housing can be had by the military. I believe this bill provides the answer to this urgent military necessity.

There are, of course, other approaches. I have considered all of these but decided finally in favor of the approach suggested in this bill. My reason for reaching this decision is twofold. First of all, I cannot visualize any appreciable advantage to be gained by utilizing any of the other approaches. Moreover, I can think of some disadvantages that appear inherent in other approaches to the problem that are not present in the suggested approach.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask also that the bill be not referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency until next Tuesday, because it is an amendment to the housing act, and

I wish to give every Senator an opportunity to become a co-sponsor of the bill.

Our military personnel need housing urgently, and I am hopeful that it will be possible to go before the Committee on Banking and Currency with a bill sponsored by practically every Member of the Senate, if not every Member. In that way, it will be possible for the committee to act on the bill promptly and to have it passed by the Senate immediately thereafter. Our military personnel do not have proper housing, which they should have; therefore, Congress should act immediately on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed and lie on the table until next Tuesday, at which time it may be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, containing the names of additional Senators who may wish to join as co-sponsors.

I did not have time to invite all Senators to become co-sponsors, because it would be a big job to speak with 95 Senators. It is for that reason that I am asking that the bill lie on the table until next Tuesday.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR TEACHERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the salaries of teachers of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, pertaining to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1505) to increase the salaries of teachers of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The statement presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

For myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] I have today introduced a bill to increase the salaries of District of Columbia teachers by \$600 per annum, effective July 1, 1955.

As a former member of the teaching profession, I am keenly aware of the inadequacy of teachers' salaries, not only in the District of Columbia but also throughout the Nation. After all, our teachers, together with parents, guide and inspire American children of today—America's leaders of tomorrow. Teachers, who are entrusted with this tremendous responsibility, deserve salaries commensurate with their high obligations.

Three other Members of the Senate have indicated their desire to increase the teachers' pay in sponsoring an omnibus bill, which bill also includes provisions relating to personnel reorganization, leave, classification, tenure, and new positions. All of these provisions are important and will require extended study. However, I am fearful lest the period necessary for such study may delay

the enactment of the vitally essential teachers' pay increase.

It is my sincere hope that Congress acts favorably and speedily upon this bill so that teachers employed in our Nation's Capital for the coming school year will be assured of long overdue and greatly deserved salary increases.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to issue a special stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in the field of conservation.

Fifty years ago President Theodore Roosevelt signed the bill establishing the United States Forest Service. He immediately named Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania, one of America's great conservationists, as Chief Forester.

Even earlier President Benjamin Harrison signed a bill setting aside certain timbered areas as "forest preserves." His first official act was to set aside and create Yellowstone Park Timberland, now Yellowstone National Park. During the remainder of his administration he set aside 13 million acres. President Cleveland followed by adding an additional 20 million acres.

In more recent times the American people have come to a general realization of the wisdom and prudence of conservation, not only of our forested areas but the need to practice soil conservation, water conservation, fish and wildlife conservation, and the conserving of our mineral resources.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower has often expressed his belief that we must expand the program of water conservation in which protection against the denuding of forest areas is so important.

So, Mr. President, I urge favorable action on this bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue a special stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in the field of conservation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an article by Aubrey Graves, known as the "Squire of Grigsby Hill," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 30, 1955, which tells the story of the growth of the United States Forest Service, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1506) to authorize the issuance of a special stamp commemorative of the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in conservation, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil

Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, on as early a date as is practicable during the calendar year 1955, a special postage stamp of 3-cent denomination, of such appropriate design as he shall prescribe, in recognition of the outstanding accomplishments in the field of conservation, and in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the United States Forest Service.

The article presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 30, 1955]

To early settlers the wide land that later became the United States must have appeared as one vast wooded area. Most of the country except the Great Plains was covered with timber.

In the beginning the forest was both blessing and hardship. It supplied the pioneer with fuel and building material. But at times it stood in his way.

Before he could farm or build a road, timber had to be cleared away. Sometimes it was felled carefully with an ax. Too often the unthinking found it easier to put huge stretches to flame.

Later the woodlands were logged, with little thought of the future. Lumberjacks chopped through the dwindling forests, leaving wastelands as their sawmills moved onward.

Not until 1891 was anything really done to crack down on fire and reckless chopping. That year Congress authorized the President to set aside "forest preserves."

President Benjamin Harrison created the first—Yellowstone Park Timberland. Before his term was over he had set aside 13 million acres. President Cleveland added more than 20 million.

In 1898, Gifford Pinchot, a great conservationist, was appointed head of the Forestry Division. When President Theodore Roosevelt signed a bill creating the Forest Service in 1905, Pinchot became Chief Forester. From the Secretary of Agriculture came this directive: Manage the Forest Service reserves so that they would provide "the greatest good to the greatest number of people in the long run."

Our system of national forests now reaches from the West to the Lake States, from Puerto Rico to Alaska. It takes in East and South. It lies within or across the borders of 40 States. Today there are more than 150 national forests, covering 181 million acres.

The Service has grown from a handful of crusading conservationists to a vast land-management, research, and educational agency. It has more than 6,700 year-round employees, and twice that many during the forest-fire-danger season.

Millions of woodland acres, once stripped by cutting and by fires, have been replanted—by private owners and Government seeders. Today our woods are producing 5 billion board feet of lumber annually, all the Nation needs. Foresters tell us that production can be doubled when necessary.

Within their shady depths, our forests furnish seasonal grazing to millions of cattle and sheep. In them millions of Americans find recreation.

One-third of all our big game animals and countless thousands of fur bearers and waterfowl live therein. Beaver, deer, elk, moose, mountain goats, bighorn sheep and many kinds of birds attract hunters by the thousands.

More than 80,000 miles of trout streams and 1,550,000 acres of lakes offer sport to the angler.

The wilderness is rapidly vanishing from our continent but within the national forests about 75 areas (some 14 million acres in all) have been set aside to remain free of nearly all man-made changes.

These wilderness areas are accessible only by trail or water. "Practical" men preaching "progress" still try to encroach upon them, but up to now have been directed to go elsewhere to build their power dams.

The Forest Service has come a long way.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. KUCHEL) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at the Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., March 17, 1955, before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

By Mr. ERVIN:

Jefferson-Jackson Day address delivered by Senator ANDERSON at Raleigh, N. C., on February 5, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Russia, China, and the Outlook in the Pacific," delivered by him before the Intelligence Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association, in Washington, D. C., on March 16, 1955.

Statement prepared by him and an address delivered by Hon. Morehead Patterson relating to the international atomic-energy program, which will appear hereafter in the RECORD.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. ALLOTT):

Statement prepared by Senator ALLOTT concerning National Correct Posture Week.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE BILL 256, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CUMULATIVE VOTING OF SHARES OF STOCK IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on S. 256, to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association, beginning at 10:00 a. m. on Thursday, April 7, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone, National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. McFADDEN, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert C. McFadden, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana, vice Julius J. Wichser, resigned.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee on or before Friday, March 25, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF THOMAS H. TRENT, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Thomas H. Trent, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida, vice Leo H. Brooker, resigned, to file with the committee in writing on or before Friday, March 25, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF CERTAIN CIRCUIT JUDGES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 29, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Louie W. Strum, deceased.

Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are at the desk three resolutions coming from the House of Representatives, namely, House Concurrent Resolution 91, House Concurrent Resolution 93, and House Joint Resolution 250. They relate strictly to the business of the House of

Representatives. I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object, because these measures come under the rule of comity and the custom of the two Houses in respect to purely housekeeping matters, to permit such measures coming from the other body to go through in the way it desires—for the record I merely wish to state that this should not be considered a precedent for Senate resolutions or for other measures which normally require joint action by the two bodies.

However, I have no objection in this case, inasmuch as these measures are House resolutions only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 91.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the said committee during the 83d Congress, 2d session, on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs.

HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE—REPRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 210

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 93.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is ordered to be reprinted 100,000 copies of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress, entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," by Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of 90 days after which time the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELECTRICAL OR MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT FOR USE OF MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 250) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, which was read twice by its title.

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That subsection (c) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives," approved March 25, 1953 (2 U. S. C., sec. 112a (c)), is amended by striking out "not more than two of each of."

Sec. 2. The first section of such joint resolution is further amended by adding after subsection (c) thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Except in case of electric typewriters, not more than two of each of the general types of equipment described in subsection (c) may be furnished under this joint resolution for use in the office of a Member, officer, or committee."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

PUBLICATION OF THE YALTA PAPERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for not more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this week the official State Department documents on the Yalta Conference were released. I do not intend to go into this subject in any detail today, but I do wish to make several observations which I think may be of interest to the Senate and to the country.

First of all, the Yalta Conference itself was held from February 4 to February 11, 1945. A brief communique was issued February 12, 1945. After his return home President Franklin D. Roosevelt reported to a joint session of Congress on March 1, 1945.

At this time I wish to direct the attention of Members of the Senate to that report, which appears in the permanent edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, March 1, 1945, beginning on page 1618 and extending through pages 1619, 1620, and 1621, and ending on page 1622, where the message to the joint session in the Chamber of the House concludes.

The significant feature of that speech, which I have read and reread, is that, after a condensation of the discussions which took place at Yalta concerning the European phases of the program, there appears this paragraph—and I quote it precisely as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from the speech of the President of the United States making an official report to the two Houses of Congress, a coequal branch of the Government, sitting in joint session:

Quite naturally this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war.

I can thoroughly understand, in wartime, the necessity of not making certain documents available for general public use. I can understand an expression

wherein a President of the United States, reporting to a coequal branch of the Government, might say that in the national interest it was not well to discuss certain matters in public. I can understand, under certain circumstances, his making no mention of the situation at all in a public session. But I think—and I say it reluctantly—that that report comes near to being what, in the Army, we called a "false official report" to a coequal branch of the Government of the United States.

I doubt if any person holding the office of President of the United States has the right to mislead the Congress. The fact of the matter is, as everyone knows, that the Yalta conferences dealt with many problems in the Pacific, including China, including Japan, including Korea, including the Sakhalin Islands, and the Kuriles. The Yalta Conference dealt with a great many problems in the Pacific.

V-E Day occurred on May 7, 1945. V-J Day occurred on August 14, 1945. These dates are important, I believe.

Requests for the Yalta agreement by congressional committees and Members of Congress were denied. I am speaking now only of the period subsequent to August 14, 1945, when the fighting in the Pacific stopped. For the remainder of that year, during all of 1946, and until March 24, 1947, requests of Members of Congress were denied. It was not until March 24, 1947, that the texts of the agreements themselves were made public. That means that for a period of more than a year and a half after the war had ended and the security problem was no longer involved, the actual texts of the agreements themselves were not made public or supplied to Members of Congress.

It was not until 8 years after the publication of the agreements and 10 years after the conference that other documents relating to the Yalta Conference, released this week, were finally made available to the Congress of the United States.

Prior to this week Members of Congress could get a piecemeal view of the Yalta Conference by reading various books which deal with the subject. Several of them have been called to my attention. I have personally read the following:

As He Saw It, the story of the world conferences of F. D. R., by Elliott Roosevelt, his son, who accompanied him to the several conferences. This book was published in the year 1946.

Triumph and Tragedy, volume VI, Second World War Memoirs of Sir Winston Churchill, published in 1953.

Roosevelt and the Russians—the Yalta Conference—by the late Edward Stettinius, Jr., formerly Secretary of State, published in 1949.

Speaking Frankly, by James F. Byrnes, published in 1947.

I Was There, by Admiral William D. Leahy, published in 1950.

In addition, there was the very excellent book by Mr. Sherwood, on Roosevelt and Hopkins, which throws some additional light on the Yalta Conference.

It is clear from the papers released this week that Stalin refused to meet anywhere except on Soviet soil. The Russians supplied the household help. We know that subsequently they planted electronic devices in an American Embassy in a Communist country. Is there any reason to believe that they had not provided similar devices in the Czar's summer palace, and other buildings set aside for conference purposes?

Granted that there may be valid reasons for withholding public release of information in time of war, does any President have the moral right to give misinformation to a coequal branch of the Government? When a war is over and security is no longer an issue, is it good public policy to deny the text of such an agreement as Yalta to committees and Members of Congress? Remember V-J Day was August 14, 1945, and the text of the agreement was denied to committees and Members of Congress until March 24, 1947, a period of 19 months. The background information was withheld for a period of almost 10 years. In reaching decisions should Members of Congress have to depend upon private memoirs, biographies, and books?

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning there is a lead editorial which begins as follows:

Publication of the Yalta papers reopens old wounds and opens a lot of new ones. The papers show no secret engagements whatsoever. Alger Hiss is revealed not as a principal architect of anything, but as a technician working among other technicians by the side of the American member of the Big Three.

No responsible individual that I know of has ever claimed that Alger Hiss was a principal architect in the Yalta Conference or, indeed, even a chief negotiator. However, he was there. He sat in numerous conferences, and was not limited to listening to or participating only in the United Nations phases of the situation. If the Soviet Union had advance access to our positions and policies, it would be like a man playing poker with a mirror at his back, in which his opponent could see his hand before the play began.

Perhaps the most detailed account of the Yalta Conference until the recent publication was Mr. Stettinius' book. He was Secretary of State at the time of the Yalta Conference. Presumably he was the President's chief adviser on foreign policy, though I think it is fair to say that probably the President was acting more or less as his own Secretary of State. But I refer those who have tried to indicate that Mr. Hiss played no important part at Yalta to Secretary of State Stettinius' book. On page 30, for example, he mentions that Mr. Hiss was there as Deputy Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs. He mentions the various conferences he attended.

On page 83, Secretary of State Stettinius says:

My usual daily schedule, for instance, was to confer with Matthews, Bohlen, and Hiss just after I got up in the morning. I next discussed conference problems with the President.

On the same page he says:

After these dinners I usually conferred again with Matthews, Bohlen, Hiss, and Foote.

On page 103 of the same book, former Secretary of State Stettinius says:

The Americans, sitting behind the President, varied somewhat from session to session but usually included Hopkins, Matthews, and Hiss, and sometimes Foote.

On page 138 the Secretary writes:

I sat at the President's right. Behind the President sat Hopkins, Matthews, and Hiss.

On pages 196 and 197 former Secretary of State Stettinius mentions that, in dealing with the question of multiple voting in the United Nations, that question had been taken up in a subcommittee on which Hiss was the American representative.

Mr. President, I call this subject to the attention of the Senate because in the light of subsequent developments, particularly the conviction of Hiss for giving perjured testimony relating to turning over secret documents of the Government of the United States to an espionage ring in this country, it is apparent that Hiss did not have to be an active negotiator and did not have to be a principal architect at the conferences to do great damage. All he had to do was to sit in and be privy to the information available at the conferences in order to be able to do tremendous harm to the Government of the United States and to the people of the United States and, indeed, to the President he was supposed to be loyally serving.

At a later date I intend to go into the subject in some detail. I believe there is a great deal of information in the documents which have just been made available which will throw much light on this important subject. I believe these matters should be explored, not for any purpose of stirring up acrimony or reopening old wounds, but in an attempt to make certain that never again in its history will our country participate in a meeting such as the one held at Yalta, and place the lives and liberties of millions of people throughout the world in jeopardy in a secret conference in which the nations that are bartered away have no voice or vote in the making of decisions which so vitally affect their ultimate destiny.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall not ask that I be permitted to speak for 10 minutes, or any length of time, on the subject of these papers whose release has electrified the capitals of the free world. But I believe that I should make a very brief statement at this time. I do not plan that it shall be my last statement on the subject.

I realize that I am not sufficiently versed in international diplomatic customs to render a positive and final judgment on the effect of the action taken by the Secretary of State. Nor have I had an opportunity to give these bulky documents, which were laid on my desk the day before yesterday, the thorough consideration they deserve.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, according to the New York Times today, the distinguished occupant of the Chair, the

chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE], who has spent a lifetime in the study of this problem, has stated that the publication of the papers will have "a bad effect" on our international relations.

The publication of the papers raises some disturbing thoughts. Since this is an administration which is so strongly committed to the concept of responsibility, I must assume that the Secretary of State had a highly responsible purpose in mind when he released the documents. Surely they were not released merely for the sake of disposing of excess papers in the files of the State Department.

It has been my belief that the objective of the State Department should be to gear all its activities to winning the cold war and to preserving the United States from the menace of communism. That, we believe, is the basis of the bipartisan ship which we Democrats have so willingly and cheerfully and wholeheartedly advanced. The Democrats have no intention of altering their approach to foreign relations.

We believe that every American would rather win the cold war against communism than win a cold war against another political party.

Frankly, I do not know the purpose that will be served by the hasty publication this week of these documents. I do not know what purpose will be served, so far as the unity and the determination of the freeworld is concerned, by hasty comments on paragraphs of this bulky release.

I do know that the press this morning relates that one of the participants at the conference has already challenged the accuracy of the papers. I do know that the press is full of comments from distinguished experts in the field of diplomacy, who indicate that they are very uneasy over the results that may flow from publishing the papers.

We must face the fact that the publication of these papers may have—at least for the immediate future—ended international conferences at which participants will fully and freely discuss with each other the problems of the world.

Mr. President, I suggest that we let the record show that we will have to leave it to the judgment of history to determine whether this move this week was intended to promote the cause of freedom and of America and of the free world, or whether we submerged international relations to purely domestic political considerations.

REMARKS ON REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The committee report does recognize that "the President's Economic Report looks for a continued advance in general economic activity" in that "it is reasonable to expect that within the coming year we can approximate the levels of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power envisage by section 2

of the Employment Act." The committee report concludes that these levels seem "to imply national production of about \$375 billion for the year as a whole, with a year-end rate of about \$385 billion, on the basis of committee staff projections," and that "most of the witnesses at the recent committee hearings warned, that during the second half of the year, the advance may be less than during the first half."

The implication of these statements obviously is that the economy will not reach that level of economic activity which the President's report indicates that it in all probability will reach.

The latest expert opinions, however, seem to indicate, quite to the contrary, that a gross national product of \$375 billion will in all probability be achieved. For example, the March 14 issue of *Newsweek* magazine concludes:

The wary economists who have been looking for a production letdown in the last half of the year are not so sure now. And even the optimists are beginning to raise their sights. * * *

The way things look now, barring a major strike, 1955 could wind up with gross national product at a breathtaking \$375 billion. Top officials privately expect the year's first quarter to show the Nation's output of goods and services running around \$368 billion. The all-time high, set in the second quarter of 1953, was \$370 billion.

The reported change in expert opinion, therefore, should impress upon the public the need for viewing such economic projections as those relied upon by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, with a great deal of caution and reserve.

The economic outlook for 1955 is indeed excellent, and the American people can have faith in the President's statement that:

The Nation's output within the coming year will approximate the goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power envisaged by the Employed Act.

Mr. President, I ask that this article from *Newsweek*, entitled "The Periscope—Business Trends," be printed in its entirety at this point in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE PERISCOPE—BUSINESS TRENDS RAISING THE SIGHTS

The wary economists who have been looking for a production letdown in the last half of the year are not so sure now. And even the optimists are beginning to raise their sights.

Many top administration officials still think the astounding automobile production race will have to gear down. But they are no longer so positive the deceleration has to be drastic.

One of Detroit's most optimistic—and accurate—forecasters, General Motors president Harlow Curtice, now predicts a 7.5 million-car year. That would mean sales and production volume some 20 percent over 1954's—and a new record. Earlier, Curtice was talking of a 10 percent gain for 1955.

The way things look now, barring a major strike, 1955 could wind up with gross national product at a breath-taking \$375 billion. Top officials privately expect the year's first quarter to show the Nation's output of goods and services running around \$368 billion. The all-time high, set in the second quarter of 1953, was \$370 billion.

PRESSURE ON PRICES

The industrial barometers, however, are also showing pressures building up for a fresh price spiral, starting in the basic metals.

The worldwide tight supply of copper has already inflated its price tag. Aluminum ingots recently climbed a cent a pound. Steel looks to be next.

The makings of a steel spiral are already here. The industry is braced for one increase when this year's wage negotiations with the steelworkers' union take place.

The workings of the steel market will very likely pile another price hike on top of that one.

THE RAW MATERIALS

Bidding by Europe's—and later, Japan's—reawakened steel mills neutralized United States companies' efforts to check a runaway in prices of steel scrap. Scrap is up to close to \$37 a ton, compared with less than \$30 last September.

Now American steelmakers need more scrap and the outlook is for scrap prices to keep right on going. The other ingredients that feed the blast furnaces are bound to follow. (That was the pattern in copper.) Iron-ore prices have inched upward; limestone, pig iron, and coking coal will do the same.

Aluminum, the No. 1 substitute when copper or steel turn hard to get, is no longer plentiful. Aluminum makers, whose expansion plans were stymied by Washington last year, are working hard to catch up now—with costs higher.

THE HUNGRY CUSTOMERS

Predictions that steel demand would slack off during the last half of this year now seem very shaky.

Even if auto production lines eased up on their voracious steel consumption, steelmakers would still have plenty of customers. For one thing, steel inventories have been worked way down and steel users are anxious to replenish them.

The railroads, which cut plant and equipment spending in 1954, are ready to resume at their old \$1 billion-a-year rate.

The steel industry itself (and it's one of its own best customers) had ticketed about \$700 million earlier this year for expansion. Now there is talk that this will not be enough.

The administration's \$101 billion road program opens up fresh markets for steel—not only for the metal that will go into the roads themselves, but also for the army of road-building machines the project will need.

RAILROADS PULL AHEAD

The pellmell rush of industrial activity has started the railroads clicking faster, too. So far this year, carloadings have been running more than 2 percent ahead of last year—and the lines usually don't roll out of their winter slump until March.

Significantly, the margin of improvement over last year's figures has been steadily widening.

Railroadmen expect the second quarter to improve still further, with a good chance that traffic for the year will wind up about 3 percent better than 1954. This would put profits much higher.

REPORT OF HOOVER COMMISSION TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on February 19, a task force on Federal Medical Services of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government, better known as the Hoover Commission, filed its report.

This report recommends the closing of 19 Veterans' Administration hospitals. Two of these hospitals are located in Kentucky. One is at Fort

Thomas, Ky., the other is at Outwood, Ky.

The Hoover Commission report of February 28, transmits the report of its task force. This report does not make the same recommendation as that made by the task force. It asks that Administrator of the Veterans' Administration "consider the recommendations made by the task force as to closing of certain hospitals and obtain the advice of the proposed Federal Advisory Council of Health on these recommendations."

Mr. President, this does not, in my view, minimize the threat to these hospitals, which have been accomplishing outstanding work in the treatment of our veterans.

The hospital at Fort Thomas has a capacity of 395 patients, but there are now 404 patients in the hospital, 9 more than the capacity.

The hospital at Outwood has done an excellent job in the treatment of tuberculosis cases. Most of the veterans at this hospital are from the area and by receiving treatment at Outwood they are able to have the benefit and joys of visits from their family and friends.

The majority of the patients at Outwood are veterans of World War I. Their average age is 62, and since they have been ill for many years they have not been able to build up social-security benefits and other sources of income which would make it possible for them to live their remaining years with a measure of security and care, except that which is given them at this hospital.

Apparently, Mr. President, the recommendation for closing these hospitals does not come from any lack of need for such facilities. I quote from the report of the task force itself to show that Veterans' Administration hospitals are desperately needed. Page 56 of this report states the following:

There has been an increase in the total patient load in VA hospitals in the past year. Although the patient load is apparently now in equilibrium, the continued increase in the number of veterans and the aging of the present veteran population can be expected to increase the pressures for more veterans' hospital construction in the future.

It is apparent also that the proposal to close these hospitals does not reflect the attitudes and desires of those who live near these installations and those who have observed their workings and their benefits.

I have had correspondence and discussions with many from Kentucky who speak forcefully of the need for these hospitals.

Only last week, leaders of the Kentucky Department of the American Legion were in Washington at the National Rehabilitation Conference. Meeting with State Commander Rodney Brown and his staff, I discussed the matter of closing these hospitals. He presented the strongest opposition to this action and stated that it would weaken the veterans' program immeasurably in Kentucky and in the surrounding areas served by both Outwood and Fort Thomas.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD resolutions and communications I have received which pertain to the recommendations of the task force.

There being no objection, the resolutions and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: Resolution protesting the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital

Whereas it is the feeling of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky., that the closing of the Fort Thomas Hospital would directly affect more than 100 families of Newport, Ky., who have patients or are employees of the hospital; and

Whereas it would also cause a loss of revenue to merchants of the city of Newport, Ky.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky.:

SECTION I. That the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky., does by this resolution, protest the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital, Fort Thomas, Ky.

SEC. II. That a copy of this resolution of protest be sent to the Senators, Representatives, and Veterans' Administration officials.

SEC. III. That this resolution shall be signed by the mayor, attested by the city clerk, recorded and published. Same shall be in effect at the earliest time provided by law.

Adopted this the 11th day of March 1955.

ROBERT L. SIDELL,

Mayor.

Attest:

ROBERT SCHOMAKER,

City Clerk, Acting.

BROTHERHOOD OF PAINTERS, DECORATORS, AND PAPERHANGERS

OF AMERICA,

LOCAL UNION NO. 215,

Newport, Ky., March 7, 1955.

Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS.

DEAR SIR: At our last regular meeting I was instructed to write you, asking you to do everything in your power to prevent the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital. It is a big help to the merchants and working people of this community and would be sorely missed if closed, especially by the painters. We have four men under civil service, who work there steady, and each year a number of others get work on the purchase and hire plan, when they do extra work at the hospital. It has been responsible for hundreds of man-days for painters in this district, and would be a big loss to us for we have lost so much work to the "do it yourself" campaign that our craft is in a depression hereabouts. Thanking you for anything you can do.

I am,

JAMES J. BURNS,

Recording Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, KENTUCKY,

Campbell County, Ky., February 28, 1955.

Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: On page 1 of the Kentucky Times-Star, issue of February 26, 1955, is an 8 column heading, saying in part: "Closing of VA Hospital Rumored, Fort Thomas Hospital Is Listed Among 19 To Be Discontinued." The Hoover Commission will report to Congress Monday and it will recommend the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital.

As a disabled veteran of World War I, and having served for four terms as a member of the Kentucky House of Representatives, and at nearly every session having served as a member of the House Veterans Committee and also having served since its inception as a member of the local committee to pro-

mote the work of the hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., and knowing the needs of and the services rendered by this hospital, I am emphatically opposed to such a reported move and urge upon you to use the powerful influences of your good offices to prevent the closing of this hospital, at this time, or any other time.

There are now 404 patients at the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital and 9 more than the capacity of the institution, and I can't understand why anyone would recommend its closing when it is rendering such a great and efficient service to our sick and disabled veterans.

Therefore, I urgently recommend that when this report is presented to Congress that you use every means at your command to defeat this move to close our local VA hospital.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. WIRSCH,

Representative, 62d Kentucky District.

AMERICAN WAR DADS,

KENTUCKY STATE ASSOCIATION,

Louisville, Ky., March 1, 1955.

Senator EARLE CLEMENTS,

The United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: The American War Dads of Kentucky are very much opposed to the bill to close veterans hospitals in any part of the United States.

We, as a patriotic organization, are aware of the need of veteran hospitals.

Therefore, we ask that you oppose the bill when it comes before the Senate.

With every good wish to you personally.

Respectfully yours,

WM. G. TOMPKINS,

President.

LADIES' AUXILIARY,

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,

KERSTEN-O'DAY POST NO. 2899,

Bellevue-Dayton, Ky., February 28, 1955.

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS,

United States Senator, Senate Office

Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: Through the local press the public has been informed that the VA Hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., is to be closed.

The Ladies' Auxiliary to Kersten-O'Day Post No. 2899, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Bellevue and Dayton, Ky., would like to go on record as opposing this action. In the interest of the veterans we beg that you exert whatever power you have in protesting such a measure.

The VA Hospital has served long and well in this community and all civic, patriotic and fraternal organizations are doing everything possible to assist in the rehabilitation of the patients. From our observations it seems that the hospital is functioning in an excellent manner.

Anything you can do will be sincerely appreciated by our organization.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. HELEN S. FRENCH,

Legislative Chairman.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,

DIVISION OF PUBLICITY,

Frankfort, Ky., March 3, 1955.

Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Knowing of your interest in the Outwood Veterans' Hospital, I am confident that you were disappointed with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission which suggested the closing of Outwood hospital.

Your many friends in Dawson Springs and the communities of Princeton, Hopkinsville, and Madisonville, along with all persons interested in the welfare of our veterans, will appreciate your efforts in pro-

viding for the continued operation and maintenance of Outwood hospital.

With kindest personal regards and all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

MACK SISK,

Director.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is evident from these communications, Mr. President, that the interest in continuing both Outwood and Fort Thomas VA hospitals is the matter of great concern. They represent a broad segment of the community.

No responsible veterans organization, no individual veteran, or anyone interested in the well-being of those who have served their Nation faithfully and honorably, desire more for the veteran than he deserves.

But by the same token, Mr. President, those who have served their Nation, and particularly those who are in the need of mental and physical care, should not have taken from them the facilities to live a better, longer, and healthier life.

TALENT IRRIGATION PROJECT IN SOUTHERN OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks, a number of employees of various agencies of the Department of Interior have been testifying before committees of Congress in behalf of authorization of the upper Colorado storage project. The administration has thrown platoon after platoon of engineers, heads of administrative agencies, and technical experts into the lines to support this project which entails expenditure of about \$1,500,000,000.

I do not at this time intend to explain my position on the upper Colorado proposal; but, because of the administration's attitude on an important reclamation project in the State of Oregon, this display of support raises an important and unresolved question.

I have been advised by the Bureau of Reclamation that the benefit-cost ratio of the upper Colorado River storage project with 11 participating projects is 1.31 to 1. The President's 1956 budget has tentatively earmarked \$10 million for the Colorado project if it is approved by Congress. The Bureau also advised me that the irrigation benefit-cost ratio for the Talent project in southern Oregon is 1.30 to 1. Following its authorization last year, Republican Party candidates used the Talent project as a springboard for political celebrations. Yet this year, not a single dollar is provided in the budget for this necessary and beneficial project.

I wonder if this is to become the administration's policy on irrigation projects—to push for project authorization and then withdraw interest when it comes time to make the project a reality through construction? The upper Colorado River project and the Talent project have virtually identical benefit-cost features. Talent is authorized, but no construction funds are available. Will the administration's interest in the upper Colorado project suddenly wane after authorization is won, as it apparently

and unfortunately did in the case of the Talent project?

The administration's attitude on the Talent project is a betrayal of the people of southern Oregon. I shall continue to do all in my power to bring about appropriations for the Talent project, which compares favorably to undertakings the administration is promoting elsewhere in the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Commissioner of Reclamation with reference to this important question be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1955.

MR. WILBUR A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEXHEIMER: During the last 2 weeks numerous employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have testified before the Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committees relative to authorization of the upper Colorado River storage project. Testimony presented by yourself and others in the Bureau of Reclamation indicates a strong desire by the administration to obtain approval of this project, entailing expenditure of about \$1,500,000,000.

According to information received from the Acting Commissioner on March 15, 1955, the benefit-cost ratio of the upper Colorado project for irrigation is 1.31 to 1.00. The President's budget for fiscal 1956 has earmarked \$10 million for the Colorado storage project if approved by Congress. The Acting Commissioner also advised that the irrigation benefit-cost ratio for the Talent project in southern Oregon is 1.30 to 1.00. However, the budget does not earmark a single dollar for construction of this already-authorized project.

Since the upper Colorado and the Talent project have almost identical benefit-cost features, would you please advise me why the Bureau of Reclamation is pushing for approval of the upper Colorado project but has evidenced no similar interest in construction of the Talent project, which, by virtue of previous authorization, could become productive much sooner? I trust that it has not become the policy of the Bureau to funnel its energies into seeking authorization for projects, but not to follow through and seek immediate construction. If so, I wonder whether the Bureau—if the upper Colorado project is authorized—will lose interest in seeking construction funds for it, as has apparently and unfortunately been the case with the Talent project?

I would greatly appreciate it if you would advise me immediately as to plans of the Bureau of Reclamation in recommending the appropriation of funds for construction of the Talent project. In my opinion, this project should be undertaken immediately and the necessary funds made available.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier today it was my privilege to introduce to President Eisenhower an outstanding delegation of State and municipal law officers from all over the country who had come to present to the President the case for protection of consumers as regards natural gas rates.

In the course of our visit, we submitted to the Chief Executive a statement

signed by all the members of the delegation for this objective.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement containing the signatures of those present be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVES OF CONSUMERS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER OPPOSING DESTRUCTION OF CONSUMER PROTECTIONS UNDER THE NATURAL GAS ACT

We are pleased and honored to have this opportunity as representatives of natural gas consumers to present certain facts on their behalf. We are here to urge you not to approve proposed legislation¹ which will destroy the Natural Gas Act's protections for consumers.

We do not speak for any special interest, or group. We do speak for millions of consumers—little people who are unable to speak to you personally on their own behalf. We ask no special favor or exemption. Our plea is limited to a request that you do not approve any bill which allows any seller of natural gas in interstate commerce, for resale, to exploit consumers by charging unreasonable prices. It is our basic position that consumers are entitled to protection against unreasonable prices.

There were 19,959,200 national gas customer connections in the United States in 1953.² Of these, 18,386,200 were residential. In round numbers there are approximately 60 million residential natural gas users affected.³

We report to you that our people are tremendously alarmed at this legislative drive to scuttle effective regulation of natural gas rates. Most consumers have experienced one or more natural gas rate increases already in the past 3 years. And we estimate that increases from \$200 million to \$400 million yearly will eventually flow from this proposed congressional action.

NATURAL GAS ACT AIMED PRIMARILY AT PREVENTING CONSUMER EXPLOITATION

In several cases the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that "the primary aim of this legislation (the Natural Gas Act of 1938) was to protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural gas companies."⁴

Under this act, the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction to determine whether rates charged in all sales of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale by producers, gatherers, pipelines, or any other person are just and reasonable. The act requires that the FPC allow natural gas companies a just and reasonable rate of return; these companies may compel the granting of such a return by appeal to the courts.

The Natural Gas Act grew out of an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission which revealed price gouging and exploitation of consumers by sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce. The Supreme Court of the United States had previously held in two landmark decisions⁵

¹ The major bill is the Harris bill (H. R. 4560). Other pending bills of similar purpose are H. R. 3703, 3902, 3940, 3941, 4168, 4214, and 4675.

² Gas Facts (1953), p. 91 (published by American Gas Association, Bureau of Statistics). These are the latest available figures.

³ This is computed by estimating three persons per residential connection.

⁴ Federal Power Commission v. Hope Natural Gas Co. (320 U. S. 591, 610); Phillips Petroleum Company v. State of Wisconsin (347 U. S. 672).

⁵ Public Utilities Commission v. Attleboro Steam and Electric Co. (273 U. S. 83); Missouri v. Kansas Natural Gas Co. (265 U. S. 258).

that neither the State of origin nor the State of destination could control the rates charged by these sellers in interstate commerce. The Court held that under the Constitution, the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction in this field. The act was thus adopted to bridge this gap in Federal-State jurisdiction by providing Federal protections for consumers which the States may not constitutionally provide.⁶ If the act is amended as proposed in pending bills, then the price at which gas enters the pipelines will not be subject to any real regulation and all consumer protection will be effectively destroyed. With Federal protection removed, and the States constitutionally helpless to protect consumers, an unregulated—and unprotected—twilight zone would result.

CONSUMER PROTECTION UNDER ACT

A Federal Power Commission study shows that from 1938, when the Natural Gas Act went into effect, until 1946 the Commission conducted numerous rate investigations resulting in rate reductions to consumers aggregating in excess of \$157 million in such cities as Detroit, Kansas City, Cleveland, Fort Wayne, Dallas, and other cities located in Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and other States.⁷ This experience demonstrates that the consumers needed protection and that the act provided such protection.

However, large and continuing increases in field prices and the general inflationary trend caused the FPC to grant higher rates. Some half billion dollars of gas rate increases have been filed at the FPC in the past 5½ years. During the fiscal year 1954, gas rate increase applications in the amount of \$286,800,000 were under consideration. Of this total, \$106,900,000 has already been allowed.⁸

A tremendous network of pipelines now bring natural gas to nearly all the major cities in the Nation. The pipelines were built for the most part under the present act and under the representation that natural gas would be made available to consumers at a reasonable rate. Municipalities and consumers supported this pipeline development in reliance on these representations. Local distribution companies have instituted, city by city, a changeover in equipment as natural gas became available. Consumers are now absolutely dependent upon those who sell gas in interstate commerce for resale. Natural gas is now a public service commodity just as are water, electricity, and other historically regulated public service commodities. Stoves, heating units, and hot water heaters have been converted to this fuel at an expense of millions of dollars. Consumers have invested \$10 billion in this gas-burning equipment—an investment which we believe exceeds the value of all other investments in the natural gas industry. Gas is the only fuel that can be utilized by this equipment. Consumers cannot change suppliers if the particular company upon whom they have become dependent increases the price. Distributors are committed under long-term contracts to buy gas from the pipeline which serves them at a price fixed by the FPC. Interstate pipelines in turn are bound to sellers in a given field or fields by the physical location of their pipelines, which cannot readily be moved to a new field in search of a better price. Unless the FPC has jurisdiction to control that initial price

⁶ In its official reports Congress said the act was "to fill the gap in regulation that now exists by reason of the lack of authority of the State commissions" (H. Rept. 709, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3; S. Rept. 1162, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3).

⁷ Hearings on H. R. 2185 et al., 80th Cong., 1st sess., p. 463 et seq.

⁸ 34th Annual Report, FPC (1954), p. 108.

in the field no effective control exists.⁹ Proceedings before the FPC show that there is no competition between sellers and that the only competition is between buyers; who are bidding against each other for gas supplies.

Should the gasoline for his automobile prove unsatisfactory, or should his cigarettes disagree with him, there is the simple expedient open to the user of changing brands. But the only choice open to the person who is serviced by a natural gas company, which furnishes the wherewithal to enjoy a warm home, or a hot meal, is to endure whatever the particular inconvenience is or to use another fuel.

This, patently, is no choice at all. Once a person has installed costly gas-burning equipment with which to heat and cook, then the cost of changing to another fuel, measured in terms of time, inconvenience, and most important of all, money, is absolutely prohibitive. Congress was fully aware of these facts when it provided that the Federal Power Commission should regulate all sales in interstate commerce for resale. To limit the act to sales by pipelines, as the pending bills propose, eliminating sales to pipelines in interstate commerce would be to ignore obvious evils which the present act eliminates.

FABULOUS NATURAL GAS EXPANSION UNDER ACT

That the act as now written is beneficial to sellers of gas in interstate commerce, for resale, is amply demonstrated by the record of the past 17 years.

Sales of natural gas have increased from 1,200 billion cubic feet in 1938 to 5,319 billion cubic feet in 1953.¹⁰ The number of customer connections increased from 6,742,000 in 1938 to 19,959,200 in 1953.¹¹ Pipeline mileage increased from 184,900 in 1938 to 393,890 in 1953.¹² Revenues increased from \$406,352,000 in 1938 to \$2,250,120,000 in 1953.¹³

Based upon the number of consumers dependent upon natural gas for heating and cooking, the natural-gas industry has increased some 300 percent since 1938. This industry is gigantic in size and tremendous in its effect upon the national economy. It must be subject to the closest scrutiny and regulation to insure equal justice both to sellers of gas in interstate commerce and consumers. Consumers definitely are on an unequal footing with the natural-gas industry. If the act is amended so that the FPC cannot protect them, then no one can.¹⁴

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A \$200 MILLION TO \$400 MILLION YEARLY BOOST IN CONSUMER GAS BILLS

All of the proposed bills in Congress in effect prohibit the FPC from fixing reasonable rates to be charged by sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce in sales taking place

⁹ That all of this increase would be paid by consumers is beyond question. In *Interstate Natural Gas Co. v. Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682, 692-693), the Supreme Court said of prices at the origin or producing and gathering stage: "Unreasonable charges exacted at this stage of the interstate movement become perpetuated in large part in fixed items of costs which must be covered by rates charged subsequent purchasers of gas, including the ultimate consumer. It was to avoid such situations that the Natural Gas Act was passed."

¹⁰ Gas Facts (1953), p. 107.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 86.

¹² Ibid., p. 58.

¹³ Ibid., p. 128.

¹⁴ The Cabinet committee in its Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy states in part that "We believe the problem of natural-gas regulation should be approached from the viewpoint of assuring reasonable prices to consumers." But the proposed legislation removes all power to assure reasonable prices to consumers.

prior to the time the gas enters the large interstate pipelines.

In addition, the Harris bill (H. R. 4560) would compel the Federal Power Commission to allow pipeline companies for their produced gas the prevailing market price for the gas in the field where the gas is produced.

The effect of such a basic change in consumer protection is dramatically illustrated in a pending rate increase case involving the city of Denver.¹⁵ In that case Colorado Interstate Pipeline Co. has asked that this field price theory be substituted for the established method of regulation which bases prices on cost plus a reasonable rate of return. According to the figures presented there, this change means an increase in rates to consumers in the Denver area of approximately \$4 million per year—and the company claims its field rate there is not as high as it should be. Many other cities will be similarly affected if the proposed legislation is enacted by Congress.

When the Kerr bill was considered by the Congress in 1949-50, the FPC estimated conservatively that a 5 cents per thousand cubic feet increase would flow from its adoption, resulting in a \$200 million per year increase to consumers.¹⁶ That an increase of \$400 million per year, for consumers is probably now a conservative estimate of the effect of the pending bills is amply demonstrated by the great increase in reserves, markets, sales, and natural gas prices since 1950. Regardless of amount, the result of the adoption of the proposed legislation would certainly be unregulated and unreasonable prices—as witness the Denver case already mentioned.

REASONS ADVANCED FOR BILLS TO REMOVE CONSUMER PROTECTION ARE UNSOUND

The major reason advanced in support of the bills to remove existing consumer protections from the Natural Gas Act is that sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce need the removal of these consumer protections to encourage them to produce the needed natural gas. This is a familiar scare technique. It is respectfully submitted that the 27½ percent tax exemption now enjoyed by these natural gas sellers and the prices received are sufficient encouragement without this additional exemption allowing the charging of any price the traffic will bear. The tremendous growth of the industry under the existing law proves this.

In urging passage of this legislation, the industry lays great stress on the 4,000 small producers of natural gas but fails to mention that 85 percent of all the natural gas sold in interstate commerce for resale is produced by less than 100 companies—most of them oil companies—and that one-third of the supply is furnished by 7 companies. The fact is that a few big oil companies make most of the sales; it is these companies which have fought against FPC regulation since 1938 by litigation, legislative efforts, and other methods. The repeated mention of 4,000 small producers is a smokescreen intended to obscure the true situation.

Despite claims to the contrary, FPC regulation of rates charged for sales in interstate commerce for resale does not result in interference with State conservation powers.¹⁷ The Supreme Court considered hundreds of pages of testimony, briefs, and argument on this exact issue and then expressly so held in the Phillips case. Since the States cannot constitutionally control sales for resale—even at the wellhead—if they are in interstate commerce, there can be no conflict of State-Federal power. Some States fix minimum prices to protect landowners, producers, and royalty owners. No

¹⁵ FPC Docket Nos. G-2260 and G-2576.

¹⁶ Hearings on S. 1498, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 16, table 10, and p. 283.

¹⁷ The act prohibits FPC regulation of production and gathering.

State does fix, or can constitutionally fix, rates for sales in interstate commerce to protect consumers.

"REGULATION TO PROTECT HELPLESS LITTLE PEOPLE UNDER FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM"

It is a basic tenet of our free-enterprise system that the helpless little fellow must be protected from those in a position to exploit him. We have antitrust laws, laws requiring fair and truthful advertising, a minimum wage law, and a whole series of other regulatory acts designed for this express purpose. The Natural Gas Act, with its "primary aim of preventing exploitation of consumers," fits clearly within the basic tenets of our free-enterprise system and should not be changed so as to place these helpless little people at the mercy of sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce. It must be kept in mind that this is regulation of an essential public service and not an unreasonable interference with private business or private ownership of business.

It is contrary to the traditions of our free-enterprise system, whereby Government regulations are designed to protect the weak who cannot protect themselves, to subject these thousands of helpless consumers to exploitation by the great oil and gas companies—the real sponsors of this proposed legislation. These companies are seeking a congressional edict freeing them from all possible controls whereby consumers can be protected against their exploitations.

Finally, no practical difficulties are involved requiring passage of the pending legislation. That argument was likewise presented in the Phillips case to the Supreme Court of the United States and rejected, the Court stating:

"Regulation of the sales in interstate commerce for resale made by a so-called independent natural-gas producer is not essentially different from regulation of such sales when made by an affiliate of an interstate pipeline company. In both cases, the rates charged may have a direct and substantial effect on the price paid by the ultimate consumers. Protection of consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural-gas companies was the primary aim of the Natural Gas Act."

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander Wiley; William G. Callow, City Attorney, Waukesha, Wis.; Peter Campbell Brown, Corporation Counsel, New York, N. Y.; Abraham L. Freedman, City Solicitor, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ralph S. Locher, Director of Law, Cleveland, Ohio; James H. Lee, Special Corporation Counsel (utilities), Detroit, Mich.; John J. Mortimer, Corporation Counsel, Chicago, Ill.; Harry G. Slater, First Assistant City Attorney, Milwaukee, Wis.; David M. Proctor, City Counselor, Kansas City, Mo.; John C. Banks, City Attorney, Denver, Colo.; Charles S. Rhyne, General Counsel, NIMLO, Washington, D. C.; Andrew Broadbudd, Mayor, Louisville, Ky.; Vernon W. Thompson, Attorney General, State of Wisconsin; Stewart G. Honeck, Deputy Attorney General, State of Wisconsin; Benson Trimble, Nashville, Tenn.; H. J. O'Leary, Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis.

MARCH 18, 1955.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session, and the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar, the consideration of which is now in order.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United

States for a term of 15 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in considering the confirmation of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States it must be borne in mind by the Senate that the General Accounting Office is an arm or an agency of the legislative branch of government, rather than of the executive branch. This is clearly apparent from the legislative history of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which created this agency. Since that time its unique status has been specifically recognized by the Congress in connection with the passage of the various reorganization acts, which have exempted the General Accounting Office from the authority of the President to effect reorganization. The Congress considered that the General Accounting Office was not within the scope of the mission assigned to the Hoover Commission which was created to make recommendations with respect to the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

In our system of government, with its various checks and balances, the Executive is charged with the administration of the laws. This is not to say that the Congress is powerless to influence the way in which the laws it passes are administered. Certainly the Congress, having the power of the purse, has every right and duty to watch over the expenditures of appropriated moneys, and it is not without power to follow through in this respect.

The General Accounting Office was specifically created by the Congress as its agency, as its watchdog, for the purpose of examining and reporting to the Congress with respect to the manner in which appropriated funds are expended, so as to insure that all such expenditures are made in accordance with the law and with the intent of the Congress.

The greatest power yet remaining to the Congress, Mr. President, is the power of the purse. I say, the greatest power remaining to the Congress, because there has been a disproportionate growth of the executive branch of the Government. While the executive branch has grown to enormous proportions, Congress has remained essentially the same as it was in Jefferson's day. We still use Jefferson's Manual in our parliamentary debates. We have essentially the same committee structure, though there have been changes in the membership of committees from time to time. To meet new circumstances new committees have been created, but, essentially Congress remains the same.

Thus the legislative branch has been hard put to cope on a basis of equality with an expanding and powerful executive branch in this era of rapid changes. In order to mitigate this situation the Congress has, from time to time, resorted to the creation of independent agencies and has delegated to such independent agencies specific and legally designated functions. We have found this a useful means, but, Mr. President, we have seen the independence of these independent agencies assaulted by both Democratic and Republican administrations. I am

sure that all who have served in Congress, even if only for a few years, have felt the indispensable need for an independent agency such as is the General Accounting Office, specifically responsible to Congress.

Those who have served in Congress for as long as it has been my privilege to serve not only feel but know the necessity for such an independent agency.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to some of the debates in 1920 and 1921, and even further back, when the question of creating the General Accounting Office was before Congress. We find that in 1920 Congress devoted a great deal of effort toward perfecting legislation and establishing procedures to insure that the proposed new agency would, in fact, be independent of the executive branch and not directly responsible to it, but, on the other hand, would be directly and solely responsible to the Congress.

The debates in Congress during the consideration of the legislation which created the General Accounting Office clearly established that the major purpose of the Budget and Accounting Act was to provide Congress with an agency responsible to it alone, in order to enable the legislative branch to obtain, through its own representatives, required information regarding the operations of the executive branch and the expenditure of funds appropriated by Congress. It was held essential that such an agency should be established to enable Congress to keep fully informed regarding the increasing Federal expenditures. Federal expenditures were increasing then, and they have increased now to vastly greater proportions.

Even with the level of expenditures as low as it was at that time, Congress felt that, in order properly to carry out its constitutional functions and to retain its control over Federal expenditures, it was necessary to create an agency responsible to Congress alone.

I wish to read a brief excerpt from the speech of former Representative James W. Good, who was chairman of the House committee which reported the bill:

It was the intention of the committee that the Comptroller General should be something more than a bookkeeper or accountant, that he should be a real critic and at all times should come to Congress no matter what the political complexion of Congress or the Executive might be and point out inefficiency if he found that money was being misapplied—which is another term for inefficiency—and that he should bring such facts to the notice of the committees having jurisdiction of appropriations.

Thus it can be seen that in seeking to create an agency which would be completely independent of the Executive, Congress was cognizant of the degree to which independence would be directly related to the agency's responsibility to the Congress itself, on the one hand, or to the Executive, on the other hand, or, in a different set of circumstances, to a dual jurisdiction.

A study of the debate shows, further, that Congress at that time felt that the independence of this agency would largely depend upon the power to appoint and the power to remove the of-

ficial who headed the agency. A review of the legislative history of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 clearly establishes that in the absence of certain constitutional doubts, Congress would have reserved to itself the authority to select the head of its own agency. Much thought was given the possibility, namely, the inclusion in the legislation creating the agency of a provision by which the head of the proposed agency would be appointed by Congress as its agent, without any Presidential influence, control, or action.

As the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is seated before me, will recognize, because of his great training, talent, and experience as former chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, a constitutional question was involved. In fact, two major objections were raised to the suggestion that Congress itself should appoint the head of its own agency. The first was that to do so might involve a constitutional question as to the authority of Congress to make appointments of Federal officers or to take action which might affect the power of the President over the appointment of such officers; and, second, whether the terms of such officers might be terminated by succeeding Congresses on a possible partisan, political basis.

Congress resolved those doubts, as Congress resolves many doubts, by some understandings among those who exercised the responsibility at that time.

To meet these objections, the appointive power was vested in the President, but under conditions which were designed to create tenure of office on a basis similar to that pertaining to the appointment of Federal judges, in the sense that the appointees would not be removed by the President, but only, in this case, by a resolution of Congress or by impeachment.

The bill as passed by Congress in 1920 provided that the Comptroller General or the Assistant Comptroller General was to serve during good behavior, and could be removed only when either officer "is incapacitated, or has become inefficient, or has been guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance of office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude and for no other cause and in no other manner, except by impeachment."

It was provided further that whenever action was to be instituted to remove either of these officers under the prescribed conditions, only action by Congress itself, through the adoption of a concurrent resolution, would be effective in bringing about removal.

President Wilson vetoed that bill on June 4, 1920, on the ground that the provision authorizing removal by concurrent resolution of Congress was in violation of the constitutional authority vested in the Chief Executive to remove appointive officers, and that its enactment would be an encroachment on the authority of the President.

That bill, then, did not become law in 1920; but essentially the same bill was reintroduced in the succeeding Congress and, without material change, was signed by the succeeding President on June 10,

1921, and became law. There was, however, this change: The term of office of the Comptroller General was fixed at 15 years. His tenure was limited to one term. Provision was made for removal for cause by Congress by joint resolution instead of by concurrent resolution.

Thus, Mr. President, we see that in the creation of this agency Congress had one resolute purpose. That was to create an agency responsible to Congress, and Congress alone; to create an agency which is just about the only agency Congress has to exercise surveillance over the expenditures of the then vast amounts of money appropriated by the Congress, and the now vastly greater amounts.

That law remains unchanged to date despite efforts to change it. There has been antagonism on the part of the executive branch of the Government toward the General Accounting Office. I have witnessed that antagonism in Democratic administrations. But, as a Member of the legislative branch, I have resisted all efforts to compromise the independence of the General Accounting Office or to compromise its sole responsibility to the legislative branch of government.

I have been told by elder Members of the Congress, both recently and in former years, that back in 1921 there was a sort of gentlemen's understanding, so to speak, that the Comptroller General would be appointed upon recommendation of Congress. The constitutional phrase "advise and consent" with respect to the Comptroller General has never been treated as a mere matter of confirmation. It must not be so treated now.

Mr. President, it is in the light of this legislative background that the pending nomination must be considered. It is in the light of this background, and in the light of the practices through the years since 1921, that the Senate must consider the qualifications of the nominee whose name is now before it. In the present instance it is only through the act of withholding confirmation that the Congress may preserve its traditional rights in the selection of its own agency heads. In this sense the confirmation process differs materially from that pertaining to confirmation of officials of the executive branch, who are, as they should be, responsible to the President.

Moreover, the Senate has a further responsibility. It must guard the rights of the House of Representatives as well as those of the Senate. The power of confirmation is vested in the Senate; the House of Representatives cannot partake of it. Thus, the act has vested in the Senate the responsibility of advising and consenting for the entire legislative branch to the appointment of a Comptroller General.

Mr. President, before going further, I should like to make it clear that the views I express as to the qualifications of Mr. Campbell, the nominee under consideration, are neither personal in nature, partisan in purpose, nor motivated by Mr. Campbell's part in the Dixon-Yates contract. I must suggest that Mr. Campbell's part in the Dixon-Yates contract has by no means added luster to his record. I respectfully submit,

however, that it is not controlling, or even a major factor, in the determination of my position or in the position I now lay before the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the junior Senator from Tennessee yield to the senior Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It seems to me, however, that the fact that the person who has been nominated to be Comptroller General was willing to use another independent agency of the Government, to wit, the Atomic Energy Commission, for a purpose entirely foreign to the purposes for which it was formed, certainly does not indicate that he has a proper perspective of the necessity of keeping independent agencies performing the line of duties for which they were created, but, on the other hand, indicates a lack of knowledge on the part of Mr. Campbell as to the operation of the various branches of the Government, which knowledge I certainly would regard as important.

Mr. GORE. I recognize the cogency of the statement which my senior colleague has made. As I indicated, I was displeased that a commissioner of an independent agency would yield the prerogatives of the office to which he had been appointed and to perform the duties of which office he had taken the oath.

I submit, however, that is an illustration of an attitude which Mr. Campbell then entertained and, so far as I know, may still entertain, to which I shall later make reference.

If I may give an illustration, opposition or support of the Dixon-Yates contract is not the measure by which I have attempted to develop my position today. I say now I would gladly support for appointment as Comptroller General such outstanding champions of the Dixon-Yates contract as our former colleague, the Honorable Homer Ferguson, or Representative STERLING COLE, or other Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives. My opposition to Mr. Campbell is more basic. My statement that I would give my support to the two distinguished gentlemen whom I have named for the position of Comptroller General, if they were before the Senate for confirmation, is based upon the fact that they have essential qualifications for the position which Mr. Campbell lacks. Of course I would prefer to see those gentlemen alter their position with respect to the Dixon-Yates contract, but I submit that that would not be the determining or controlling factor in my position.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In creating independent agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the Panama Canal Railroad, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and many, many others, Congress was careful to prescribe their lines of responsibility and duty. It is the duty of the Comptroller General to see that the congressional intent is strictly fol-

lowed. He is the watchdog, so to speak, to see that one agency does not get into the business or field of another, and that the various departments and agencies perform their functions properly, along clear-cut lines, as established by Congress.

It is very difficult for me to conceive how a person who was a member of one of those agencies could countenance its use for a purpose foreign to that for which it was created, and to the detriment of the agency itself. I say that because, despite all the argument, we know that this diversion on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission has thwarted our program. We read that the British have gotten ahead of us in the development of reactor piles for the generation of electricity; and there are many other evidences of this situation.

So it is difficult for me to understand how the perpetrator of that kind of misuse of the function of an executive agency can be a proper person to supervise the proper performance of the duties of the independent agency known as the General Accounting Office.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of my distinguished and able senior colleague.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is the duty of the Comptroller General? Is it not to save the money of the people of the United States, and to prevent its use by persons who are grafters or crooks?

Mr. GORE. That is certainly a major part of his function. The function of his office is quasi-judicial, namely, to see to it that the funds appropriated by Congress are expended lawfully, efficiently, and economically.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that I have a distinct recollection that some years ago the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] rose on this floor and read a letter from Lindsay Warren, in which Mr. Warren said that certain ships which were sold by the Maritime Commission for almost nothing subsequently were insured for hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars; and later, in some instances, when the Government needed the ships during World War II, it had to pay enormous prices in order to buy back the very ships it once had sold for almost nothing.

I remember that Lindsay Warren mentioned that the Standard Oil Co., as I now recall, leased some of the ships for almost nothing, and later charged large sums of money for them when they were used for cargo purposes by the Government. I thought Lindsay Warren did a remarkably fine job when he revealed to the Senator from Vermont some of the things he had discovered when he was Comptroller General.

Certainly in connection with his contacts the Atomic Energy Commission, during his service as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee

has learned that the Tennessee Valley Authority, by building the plant, could have saved between \$90 million and \$150 million. Yet, Mr. Campbell voted for the Dixon-Yates contract. In the last analysis, the Government will thereby lose between \$90 million and \$150 million.

The Comptroller General of the United States has the job of auditing, as I understand—I assume that is part of the job, is it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. A part of his job will be to audit—I would not say the expense accounts—but to audit the work of the various independent agencies, with the idea of saving money for the taxpayers of the United States. Can the Senator from Tennessee reconcile that responsibility with the nominee's record?

Mr. GORE. I can not. However, I return to the statement I made earlier to my colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] namely, I hold that the nominee's action with respect to the Dixon-Yates contract is an illustration of a philosophy of government and a personal attitude toward political responsibility that is more disqualifying than his action on that particular contract would be. I should like to develop that point briefly.

As I understand the position of the Atomic Energy Commissioners at that time, they never took the position that they favored the Dixon-Yates contract. In that regard, the Commission yielded to the President. I should like to read from a letter which Mr. Campbell, then Commissioner Campbell, wrote to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I shall not read all the letter; I think the excerpt I shall read will in no way be unfairly interpreted by taking it out of context. The entire letter is printed in the hearings, copies of which are now before the Senate, on page 30. I shall read only a portion of it, to which I invite the attention of the Senator from North Dakota. Before reading it, let me say that the Joint Committee was conducting a study of the structural organization of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Campbell was offered an opportunity to submit his views, and he did submit his views in this letter written on May 7, 1954:

The last, and perhaps the most significant comment that I desire to make on the organizational structure of the Atomic Energy Commission, is that it is completely devoid of political responsibility.

Mr. President, I digress to say that Congress created the Atomic Energy Commission as an independent, nonpolitical agency, having in mind the purpose of keeping it in the status of a nonpolitical organization. In fact, of the first 5 Commissioners appointed by a Democratic President, 4 were members of the Republican Party, and the fifth was an independent. So Congress thought it was necessary to have an independent, nonpolitical agency. Yet we find that Mr. Campbell complained because it is not politically responsive.

But I shall read on, and shall let his own words develop his position. I now continue to read:

We live in a political system under which the people are entitled to call to account

their public servants and to replace them through the election process in the event that their performance is unsatisfactory. This Commission, as it is established, is not responsive to the will of the people. It is only partially under the control of the executive branch and it is entirely possible that the situation could arise where a majority of the Commission might be fundamentally opposed to the philosophy of the elected Congress and Executive. Now, this is not to imply that there should be allowed any opportunity to play politics with atomic energy. The American people expect that with a new administration there will be a new Secretary of State, with new principal advisers, and that the same pattern will be followed in other executive departments.

Since the impact of the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission, both on domestic and foreign policy, in many ways exceeds that of other executive agencies which are directly responsive to the change of political administrations, there is no logical reason why the Atomic Energy Commission should be exempt from such political responsibility. The present arrangement, therefore, in my opinion, is not only bad political philosophy, but, as well, is poor administrative procedure.

Let me repeat that I thought we needed an independent, nonpolitical agency to handle the problems of atomic energy. If any agency of the Government should be nonpolitical, it is the Atomic Energy Commission. Yet, Mr. Campbell says that is bad political philosophy. He wrote the chairman of the joint committee only last year complaining that the Atomic Energy Commission is not sufficiently politically responsive. That is the man whose nomination is now before the Senate. He has been appointed to head the one and only agency which Congress has, the General Accounting Office. If he considers that the Atomic Energy Commission should be politically responsive, are we not warned that he might consider that the General Accounting Office should be politically responsive?

I read this letter to the Senate committee in the presence of Mr. Campbell. I listened to his succeeding testimony. He did not retract his philosophy. So far as the record stands, he still holds that it is bad political philosophy for the Atomic Energy Commission not to be politically responsive. Are we not thus warned?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is puzzling the Senator from North Dakota is this: If a man will take orders, as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and enter into a contract because he is ordered to do so by the President of the United States, what assurance has this body that he will not act in a similar manner as Comptroller General?

Mr. GORE. I am unable to offer the Senator any assurance. I think we must be forewarned. I remind the Senator of my statement a moment ago, that the junior Senator from Tennessee read this letter to the Senate committee in the presence of Mr. Campbell, and he did not retract that philosophy.

At the close of the hearing the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Mc-

CLELLAN], turned to Mr. Campbell and said:

As far as I know, the hearing is concluded. All who may be interested have been given an opportunity to be heard. All Senators have been notified and given an opportunity to submit their views. Except for extending to Mr. Campbell the privilege of filing a statement if he wishes to do so—and I hope that will be limited to any response you want to make to whatever Senator GORE may have testified in this statement—the hearings are concluded.

(Mr. Campbell notified the committee that he did not wish to submit any further statement.)

So, not only was opportunity accorded him then to say that he would not, in the position to which he has been nominated, apply the political philosophy which he holds, but he was invited to submit a statement later for printing in the hearings. He later notified the committee that he did not wish to make any further statement. Are we not thus warned, I ask the senior Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. This man is appointed to a position for 15 years. It strikes me that what the Congress wants is a man who is entirely independent of politics in every way. His job is to scrutinize the actions of the executive departments in dealing with public funds, so as to save the taxpayers every dollar possible. If a man in that position is to take orders from any President, Republican or Democrat, I should say that he is not the kind of man we want as Comptroller General. Does the Senator from Tennessee agree with me?

Mr. GORE. I agree entirely with the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. In fact, it might be advisable, when a Republican President is in office, to have a Democrat in the position of Comptroller General, and vice versa. Certainly there should be someone in that office as a watchdog, scrutinizing expenditures running into billions of dollars. Every once in a while we hear a story such as we heard a short time ago with respect to the Housing Administration—a story of crookedness and graft. If the Comptroller General is not on the job as a watchdog to look after the interests of the taxpayers of the country, who in heaven's name is there to do the job?

Mr. GORE. We have no one. This is the only agency which Congress has.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Tennessee says that the nominee stated that he would follow politics.

Mr. GORE. I do not know that he said he would follow politics, but I read what he said.

Mr. LANGER. Does it not mean that, when we analyze the statement?

Mr. GORE. He complained that the Atomic Energy Commission was not sufficiently responsive to the Executive politically.

Congress created the agency as a nonpolitical agency. The General Accounting Office was created for the sole purpose of serving as an agency of Congress, solely responsible to Congress, to

exercise surveillance over the vast sums which the Congress appropriates.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator whom Mr. Campbell is going to try to please in this very important position. Is he going to try to please the man who appointed him, or is he going to try to please the Congress? What is the answer to that question, based upon the record and upon what Mr. Campbell stated in his letter?

Mr. GORE. Of course, I cannot foretell how Mr. Campbell will perform the functions of this office if his nomination is confirmed. If it should be confirmed, I would earnestly hope that he would abandon his presently held political philosophy and execute the important duties of that office to the full satisfaction of the Congress. But I have no assurance which I can pass on to the Senator that such would be the case.

Mr. LANGER. Was not his appointment as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission confirmed?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Whom did he represent after he went on the Commission? Did he represent the people or the President, when the President said, "Sign that order"? How could a State government operate if the governor of the State could say to a board created to protect the interests of the taxpayers of the State of Tennessee, North Carolina, North Dakota, or any other State, "Sign this order, even though it may result in the loss of millions of dollars"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the difficulty the Senator from North Dakota has is this: The President of the United States has the right to appoint an individual to an administrative position in one of the executive departments.

However, in this case, is it not true that Congress enacted a law establishing the General Accounting Office as a creature of Congress? That makes it entirely apart from an administrative position in the executive branch of the Government. Is that not the fact?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly what the Senator from North Dakota has been trying to tell the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. The confirmation of this nomination cannot and must not be treated as routine.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. It is not like the ordinary nomination to which the Senate gives its advice and consent. In this instance, in order to avoid constitutional difficulties and a possible infringement upon the prerogatives of the President, an understanding was developed and reached under which the head of the agency was to be identified with the legislative branch.

At no previous time during the history of the agency has an appointment been made from the executive branch of the Government. Lindsay Warren, to whom the Senator from North Dakota has referred, served with distinction for about 15 years in the House of Representatives. All his predecessors in the agency

were men who had been identified with the legislative branch.

In the present instance the advice and consent must be literal, and the appointment must be made with the advice of the legislative branch. Only by the rejection of this nomination, which was made in contravention of the understanding to which I have referred, can Congress preserve its right to a voice in the selection of the head of the agency.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the executive branch of the Government. However, I do not like to see the legislative branch lose its power to pass judgment on a nomination, particularly when I am aware of the fact that so far as this nomination is concerned, it is not a Presidential appointment at all. The agency in this case was intended to be a watchdog for the legislative branch of the Government. I hope we will seriously consider what that means.

The people of North Dakota trusted the Senator from North Dakota. The people of Tennessee trusted my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee. The other Senators were trusted by their people. Are we now to surrender, not our rights—we do not say our rights—but are we now to surrender the power which in certain instances belongs to the legislative branch of the Government?

Are we going to let the appointment be a Presidential appointment? I do not have in mind a particular President. It could have been Roosevelt. It could have been Truman. It could have been Eisenhower. I am trying to protect the dignity of the United States Senate. Are we going to say that anyone may be appointed to this position? Are we going to confirm a purely executive nomination, or are we going to protect the dignity of the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico, with the understanding that the Senator from Tennessee will not lose the floor?

Mr. GORE. With that understanding, I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico, who has had vast experience and long service in the Senate, whether it is not true that formerly there was a great deal of crookedness and corruption, and that when a Senator went home and his constituents came to see him and complained the Senator would have to say, "I am helpless. We passed a law, and the Executive carries it out."

As a result, Congress finally passed a law which created the position of Comptroller General. It was intended that the agency be an agency of Congress. It was supposed to be an agency on which Congress could rely. The head of the agency was supposed to scrutinize closely the acts of the various departments and independent agencies. Are we not now being asked to surrender the power of Congress over the agency by confirming this nominee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am trying to make. I am trying to agree with the Senator from North Dakota. The agency was created by Congress. Congress wanted someone to check and scrutinize the activities and expenditures of the various Government departments and agencies. The General Accounting Office is not an Executive creation. The President of the United States did not send a message to Congress asking that the agency be created. Congress established the agency.

There have been some good administrators of that agency. Lindsay Warren, whose name has been mentioned, was one. There have been other good officials at the head of the agency. It was always understood that the General Accounting Office would be the congressional watchdogs so far as expenditures were concerned. That is what the agency was intended to be. Now, all of a sudden, we are faced with an Executive appointment, and we are asked to surrender our power.

We might as well not seek reelection in our States from now on, if we are to surrender the power over the purse strings. We might as well have only one branch of the Government, and make it all executive.

I still love my country. I still love the legislative and the executive and the judicial branches of the Government, with each of the branches performing its own functions. If that is not to be the case, we might just as well not continue to seek office in our home States.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished and able senior Senator from New Mexico. I hold that this nominee, on the one hand, lacks the essential qualifications for the position to which he has been nominated. On the other hand, he has demonstrated and expressed a political philosophy which disqualifies him. I have referred to that political philosophy.

I now wish to discuss his lack of essential qualifications for the position. In doing so I wish to say again that my position is entirely free from personal bias toward this gentleman. I have met him. He is an affable gentleman. He is a man of qualifications. He is a gentleman who might well be qualified for some other position in the Government. However, he lacks the qualifications essential for the position of Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before the Senator passes on from the general political philosophy of the nominee I should like to invite attention to a part of his political philosophy and ask the Senator what he thinks of it.

We know that, in the past, the Comptroller General in his watchdog capacity, has suggested or has had a so-called blacklist, of certain corporations, and has undertaken to use his influence against them when they have conducted themselves in violation of law or in such manner as to make them incompetent to handle Government business, and to prevent them from handling it. There is

quite a substantial precedent for such action in the Office of the Comptroller General. A number of companies, while not actually law violators, have conducted themselves in an improper way, and the Comptroller General has undertaken to see that they shall not have Government business.

In the National Holding Company Act Congress tried to prevent holding companies from getting together for the purpose of removing local control over electric rates and to prevent the kind of a situation which arose under Insull in the days of the old Electric Bond & Share Co.

In connection with the Dixon-Yates contract, as the Senator knows better than does anyone else, there is a bringing together of holding companies in violation of the spirit if not of the letter of the National Holding Company Act. Yet this nominee not only condoned it but was an actual participant in it. I do not know that the Comptroller General is going to furnish the people and the Congress of the United States any protection from the onslaughts and the greed of certain big holding companies in endeavoring to get together again as they did before the passage of the act, and do things which are diametrically opposed to the intent of Congress as expressed in the holding company law. When the nominee himself is a participant in allowing such a situation I do not see how his can be the proper political philosophy to protect the interests of the people and to carry out the will of Congress.

I do not know whether the Senator intends to cover that subject matter.

Mr. GORE. I had not intended to cover it, because I have sought to base my position upon two most fundamental grounds: One, that this nominee lacks the essential qualifications for the position; and two, that in his brief time in office in another position he expressed views which specifically disqualify him for this specific office.

An examination of the biographic data submitted with his nomination indicates that he has had advancement in his chosen profession, for which I applaud him. But, Mr. President, in addition to the circumstances, facts, and history which I have recited, upon which alone this nomination must, in my opinion, be rejected, the very nature of Mr. Campbell's background and experience, in addition to his political views to which I have referred, causes me to question the advisability of confirming his nomination.

It is imperative that the committee and the Senate consider the nature of the functions which the General Accounting Office was created to perform and does perform. It is much more than a simple accounting or bookkeeping function. Former Representative Cook spoke with great foresight when, in 1920, he envisioned that this position would be "something more than a bookkeeper or accountant." How prophetically he spoke, Mr. President.

The function of the General Accounting Office is now far more than that. It involves the interpretation of law. The record is replete with references to the duty of the Comptroller General to

pass upon the legality of expenditures. The function of the General Accounting Office is not so much to determine how much money is spent, but how it is spent. The value of the General Accounting Office to the Congress lies to a great extent in this field in order to assure that the money is spent in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Presumably, the Bureau of the Budget can be relied upon to make a tabulation of the amounts spent so as to prohibit expenditures in excess of the total amount of appropriated funds, but the Congress does not depend upon the Bureau of the Budget to advise it upon the legality of expenditures. It is upon the General Accounting Office that Congress relies for such surveillance.

I hope my remarks will not be construed as reflecting in any way upon the accounting profession or upon those who pursue it. Accountants have an important role to play in the operations of the General Accounting Office. But in the selection of an individual to head this agency, to direct its operations, to establish its policies, and to render its decisions, I believe experience and background of a legal or legislative nature are essential. Mr. Campbell is totally lacking in experience in either field or in identity with either field.

We do not find in the law any specific requirement that the Comptroller General must be a lawyer or that he must possess legal or legislative training and experience. Over the years, however, beginning with the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act, there has been developed a concept that the Comptroller General should be thoroughly familiar and identified with the legislative processes of the Government. Since the passage of the act there have been only three Comptrollers General. The first of these, who served from 1921 until 1936, was Mr. John Raymond McCarl, who had been, when appointed, secretary to Senator Norris, of Nebraska, and had succeeded at that time to the executive secretaryship of a committee. Mr. McCarl was succeeded by the Honorable Fred Herbert Brown, who had served 6 years as a Member of the Senate. Mr. Brown was, in turn, succeeded by the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, who for many years prior to his appointment, as I have said, was a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege, pleasure, and honor to serve with him. He was a distinguished Representative. He loved the legislative branch of the Government. He was loyal to it. He held its independence essential to the liberty of his country. As Comptroller General, he resisted efforts to make the General Accounting Office subservient to the executive branch. He defended the prerogatives and the power of the office which he held. He defended and upheld the responsibility of that office to Congress. His was a record of great service to his country and his fellow men.

As a result of the knowledge possessed by these men and their loyalty to the legislative procedures of Congress, and their appreciation of the value of preserving the checks and balances as be-

tween the legislative and the executive, the policies of the General Accounting Office and its direction have been such as to insure its performance of the role intended by Congress.

Members of the Senate who are now granting me the honor of an audience have themselves resisted demands to encroach upon the General Accounting Office. Yet, though we will resist efforts to bring that office under the power of the President in reorganization bills, though we will take legislative steps to insure that the General Accounting Office will be responsible to Congress, and Congress alone, we can lose this one agency of Congress by permitting the appointment of a person to head it who is not primarily loyal to the legislative branch of the Government. We can lose the last agency of Congress, the one and only agency which is solely responsible to Congress, merely by permitting or confirming the appointment of one who is primarily loyal to the executive branch; by confirming the nomination of one who has boldly asserted that even the Atomic Energy Commission should be politically responsive to the Chief Executive.

I speak not as a partisan in this respect. Because some Members are now present in the Chamber who were not present at the time I previously made this statement, I repeat that during Democratic administrations I have resisted efforts to encroach upon the responsibility of the General Accounting Office to the legislative branch alone. I would resist the confirmation of this nomination, I believe, no matter by whom the appointee might have been nominated, for he lacks the essential qualifications of the office, and he has asserted a political philosophy which is the very antithesis of the responsibility of the position to which he has been appointed, as it was envisioned in its creation.

I do not believe that the experience and qualifications of Mr. Campbell, distinguished though his career may be, have been such as to make him uniquely fitted for the position of Comptroller General. Indeed, they tend to disqualify rather than to qualify him. His record is devoid of experience calculated to steep him in the traditions of Congress and the urgency for its independence; devoid, too, of experience in the interpretation of legislative intent, and devoid of legal training and judicial review, as well.

Not only is the nominee without these essential qualifications, but he comes directly from the executive branch of the Government, thus violating another unwritten law with respect to the position of Comptroller General that has prevailed throughout more than 30 years.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that this nominee, against whom I raise not one word of personal criticism, against whom I have no personal enmity, is without the essential qualifications for the position; and that his nomination, under all the circumstances with which Members of the Senate are familiar, violates understandings which have surrounded this office since its creation in 1921.

The selection of Mr. Campbell, without the advice of the leaders of one or the other House of Congress, is an affront to Congress, and it will be only by the rejection of this nomination that Congress can preserve its right in the selection of the head of its own agency.

I summarize by emphasizing these points and ask the Senate not to confirm the nomination of Mr. Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able exposition of views made by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I desire to associate myself with those views.

History shows that the office of Comptroller General was created to give the legislative branch of the Federal Government an officer to supervise the expenditure of appropriations by executive departments and agencies. History shows also that it has been customary to appoint to this office persons whose experience in Government has been with the legislative branch—an experience which would insure their discharge of the duties of this highly important office from a legislative rather than from an executive viewpoint.

When we depart from this tradition and confirm the appointment as Comptroller General of one who comes from the executive branch of the Government, I think we destroy a very praiseworthy and necessary tradition and destroy in large measure the value of the office. If it is desired to make the office of Comptroller General the important arm of the legislative branch of the Government which it was designed to be, we must insist that the occupant of the office shall be one whose experience in Government identifies him with the legislative branch of the Government, otherwise we shall be reducing ourselves to the rather absurd position of having the executive supervise the executive, which was foreign to the thinking of Congress when it created this great office.

For these reasons, I concur in what the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has so ably said and announce that I expect to vote for the rejection of this nomination.

I do not question in any way the integrity of Mr. Campbell or his proficiency in his chosen profession as an accountant. I shall vote against the confirmation of his nomination, because of his lack of legislative experience, because of his lack of a legislative viewpoint, and because I do not believe that the office of Comptroller General can have the value it is designed to have to the Government if Congress, in effect, shall permit the executive branch of the Government to supervise itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator from North Carolina also think that the position of Comptroller General is of a quasi-judicial nature?

Mr. ERVIN. I do. The occupant of that office is called upon to pass on the legality of the expenditure of Federal moneys by the agencies and departments

of the executive branch, and I do not see how a man can pass upon legal questions if he has had no training in the legal field. I know I have spent my life in the legal field, and I have found it most difficult to pass on many legal questions. I do not believe a man who has had no experience in such an activity is capable of doing so.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to thank deeply the senior Senator from North Carolina for his generous references to my efforts in this regard. I am grateful to him. Does not the Senator think that if the nomination should be confirmed a precedent would have been established which would destroy the traditions of 34 years with respect to the office of Comptroller General?

Mr. ERVIN. If the pending nomination should be confirmed, I think not only would the traditions of 34 years be destroyed, but that in a large measure the value of the office would be destroyed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in connection with the nomination of Mr. Campbell to be Comptroller General. I realize that those who oppose his appointment are sincere. I believe they are mistaken in their viewpoints, but I am quite sure they are sincere in their opposition. I consider it to be unfortunate that a man possessing, as Mr. Campbell does, the national stature, vast experience, proficiency in his business, and a broad-gage knowledge of public and semipublic financing, should be subjected to the attacks of which he has been the object and to the charge that he is unqualified for the position of Comptroller General.

I have not known Joseph Campbell long. The very first time I ever saw him in my lifetime was on the day he appeared before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with his nomination by the President to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. I had looked through his record somewhat prior to that time. I discussed his viewpoint with him. As a member of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I became convinced that in his profession as an accountant, he had had a unique and unusual experience in matters of public finance, not only the accounting end, but the administration end, and legality end, so to speak.

The nomination of Mr. Campbell to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a short term, which term would have expired on June 30 next, was confirmed by the Senate.

The record clearly shows that some time ago he felt that the Commission was not the most satisfactory place for him to serve, because of his experience and qualifications along other lines, and he thought it was fair that he resign at that time. As I have said, his term was to have expired on the 30th of June next, anyway. But during the year or so that he served on the Atomic Energy Commission I had considerable expe-

rience with him; and I say to you, Mr. President, that I have never come in contact with a man who created a finer impression of fundamental, basic honesty and decency, straightforwardness, and high competence, than did Joseph Campbell. He is a leader in his profession, which is that of accountancy, and of investments, mostly on behalf of educational and charitable institutions. He has had experience in interpreting law—if you please from a layman's standpoint—and of straightening out and keeping on the right track the finances of some large institutions, among them Columbia University.

I shall presently read a statement setting forth in part the experience which Mr. Campbell has had in the past; but before I do that, let me say, Mr. President, that I know of no man who is better qualified for the position in Government to which he has been nominated than is Joseph Campbell. I say that sincerely, because I believe he is uniquely and unusually well qualified for that office.

In his appearance before the Committee on Government Operations, when it was considering his nomination, he made a statement, which is incorporated in the committee report. He made that statement with respect to his background, his experience, and the things he has done. It is one of the most impressive records that a man nominated for a position can bring to a committee which is considering his appointment.

I hold no special brief for Mr. Campbell, except to testify to the high admiration which I have for him as a result of association with him and observation of his conduct.

But I say to the Senate, that if our Government wishes to have in public office qualified persons who can do the work assigned them with honesty, integrity, and ability, and can do it with the same vigor, honesty, and integrity with which they have discharged their responsibilities in private life, then Mr. Campbell ranks at the top of those who are available for public employment and public service.

Mr. Campbell has had an impressive experience. As I have said, I had no knowledge of him prior to his coming to Washington, other than perhaps to read his name in a newspaper, or something of that kind. But I desire to call attention to his experience: He is a veteran of World War I. His university education was financed entirely by scholarships which he won on his own merit. He early began in the accounting business and became assistant treasurer of the Columbia University Press. Later, he became assistant treasurer of the Columbia University Corp. For a number of years he was the director of the financial business and legal aspects of the war activities of Columbia University. I think one of the motivating reasons why he was asked to serve at least for a time on the Atomic Energy Commission was that he was the moving factor on the part of Columbia University in the negotiation of contracts for experimentation in the atomic field. In connection with those activities, he gained some knowledge of that field.

Mr. President, it will be found that over the years Mr. Campbell has had extensive experience in negotiating—on behalf of both Columbia University and others—contracts with the following Government agencies: The Air Force; in the Department of the Army, the Chemical Corps, the Corps of Engineers, the Medical Corps, the Ordnance Corps, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Signal Corps; the Atomic Energy Commission; the Bureau of Public Roads; the General Services Administration; the Civil Aeronautics Administration; the United States Coast Guard; the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; the Economic Cooperation Administration; the Office of Education; the Federal Housing Administration; the Federal Security Agency; the National Academy of Science; the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; the National Research Council; the National Science Foundation; in the Department of the Navy, the Bureau of Aeronautics, the Bureau of Personnel, the Bureau of Ships, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the Navy Purchasing Office, the Office of Naval Research; also with the New Jersey State Highway Department; the United States Public Health Service; the Office of Scientific Research and Development; the Department of State; the State of New York; the Veterans' Administration; and the War Production Board.

Mr. President, where can another man with such extensive experience in governmental contract negotiations, which have been successfully conducted, be found today? Perhaps other such men can be found; but I submit that the list I have just read is one of the most impressive indications of experience in governmental contract-negotiation operations of any kind I have ever known, in the case of anyone who has been nominated to a position of service in the Government.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In reading the record, as set forth in the report, and also in listening to the Senator from Iowa refer to the outstanding record of Joseph Campbell, I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone would object to the confirmation of his nomination.

After having served in the educational field—which service has qualified him for a position requiring research and study—and also having served with so many governmental agencies, he certainly understands governmental operations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me correct a misunderstanding the Senator from Minnesota may have. I did not say the nominee had served in all those agencies. I said he had, in connection with his representation of Columbia University and others, negotiated contracts, and seen to their supervision and performance, in the case of various governmental agencies. I did not mean to give the idea that the nominee had

served in the numerous governmental agencies I listed.

Mr. THYE. I may have stated poorly my thought in that connection. What I meant to say was that he has had an excellent insight into government, as a result of having served in those various capacities and as a result of coming into contact with Federal expenditures in his educational work.

Mr. President, after having read the report, I cannot understand why there would be any objection to the confirmation of the nomination.

Therefore, I have listened with great interest to the explanation given by the Senator from Iowa of the nominee's qualifications, and I have been interested in hearing the Senator from Iowa state why in his opinion the nominee is eminently qualified to serve in the capacity of Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, before going further, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the statement of Joseph Campbell, the nominee to be Comptroller General of the United States, beginning on page 2 of the hearing before the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 84th Congress, 1st session, and continuing through to the bottom of page 7, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH CAMPBELL, NOMINEE
TO BE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that each member of the committee has a copy of the statement which I am about to read.

My purpose in preparing this statement is to disclose to you all information bearing on my appointment and relating to my past activities, including the names of the individuals with whom I have been associated during most of my working life, and the kind of business and financial transactions in which I have been involved over the years. In other words, this statement is designed to meet some important questions to which you would expect me to have the answers.

Born in New York City on March 25, 1900, I attended its elementary public schools and Townsend Harris Hall. In the spring of 1917, because of the departure of my older brothers for military service, I deferred entering college, finding instead a job as a clerk with the American Fore insurance group of New York. In August 1918 I enlisted in the United States Army as a private; I later was an acting line sergeant, and in October 1918 I was designated to attend the Field Artillery Officers' Training School at Camp Zachary Taylor, Ky. En route to that assignment on November 8, 1918, I was recalled when word was received that World War I was at an end.

Upon discharge from the Army in December 1918, I worked first on the liberty loan drive then in progress; and thereafter as a messenger, later as a clerk, in the private banking firm of William H. Goadby & Co., Manhattan, until September 1919 when I entered Columbia University.

My university education was financed entirely by scholarships and loans, supple-

mented by earnings from teaching school and private tutoring. My early college work included principally history, government, and economics, but later I devoted most of my time to statistics, accounting, auditing, business law, and income-tax courses. I received an A. B. degree in June 1924, having lost a year due to an injury and a resulting illness.

Immediately upon graduation, I started work as a junior in the accounting house of Lingley, Baird & Dixon, its principal office being in New York City. During this period I also was the assistant treasurer of the Columbia University Press, the publishing organization associated with Columbia University. In the fall of 1926 one of the firm's clients requested loan of my service, and I then began employment with Valentine & Co., paint and varnish manufacturers, as assistant controller. Subsequently I became controller of that organization and of its parent company, the Valspar Corp. In the spring of 1931 the interest which I represented withdrew from the management, and I returned to public accounting on a full-time basis with Richard T. Lingley & Co., successor to my former employer. In the spring of 1932 I became a general partner in the firm and continued as such until June 30, 1933, when I found myself with a large enough practice to establish my own organization.

Thereafter until April 30, 1941, I was engaged solely as a partner in the firm started in 1933. We had our share of routine audit and systems work, but the larger part of my own time was devoted to special examinations, investigations, and reorganizations.

In this connection I should state that I am a registered certified public accountant of New York State and of Connecticut, as well as a member of the American Institute of Accountants and of the New York and Connecticut State Societies of Certified Public Accountants.

In the spring of 1941 the trustees of Columbia University in the city of New York, for whom I had done considerable consulting work, asked me to become the assistant treasurer of that corporation, looking toward early succession to the treasurer then on point of retirement. One of their serious problems was the approaching changeover to an intensive war research, development, and training effort for the Government. I believed I had an obligation to respond to this call on my services. I sold my practice and started with the university on May 1, 1941.

From that date to the end of World War II, my principal activity at Columbia was the direction of the financial, business, and legal aspects of its war activities. At the same time, of course, I shared with the then treasurer responsibility for the management of the endowment consisting of real estate, mortgages, and securities and for such other matters as ordinarily fall within the purview of a university financial officer.

During World War II and thereafter until I entered the Government's service on July 27, 1953, I either personally negotiated or supervised the negotiation of all of the university's contracts with the United States Government, with the State of New York, and with the city of New York. In this connection, I should point out that these agreements were without financial profit to Columbia and were entered into at the request of the Federal or State or city authorities. During this period contracts with the Federal Government totaled over 800 with aggregate appropriations of approximately \$85 million and total expenditures of about \$73 million. The related work was carried on at over 30 different sites in this country and abroad by a staff of about 3,000. My own staff included principally accountants, lawyers, and auditors.

Our contracts covered the following Government offices: Air Force; Department of the Army—Chemical Corps, Corps of Engineers, Medical Corps, Ordnance Corps, Quartermaster Corps, Signal Corps; Atomic Energy Commission; Bureau of Public Roads; General Services Administration (now under Department of Commerce); Civil Aeronautics Administration; United States Coast Guard; Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; Economic Cooperation Administration (now Foreign Operations Administration); Office of Education; Federal Housing Administration; Federal Security Agency; National Academy of Sciences; National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; National Research Council; National Science Foundation; Department of the Navy—Bureau of Aeronautics, Bureau of Personnel, Bureau of Ships, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Purchasing Office, Office of Naval Research (formerly Office of Research and Inventions); New Jersey State Highway Department; United States Public Health Service; Office of Scientific Research and Development; Department of State; State of New York; Veterans' Administration; War Production Board.

In addition, the university performed under substantial subcontracts with industrial organizations in turn working for the Government.

Among these activities was, of course, the so-called atomic-bomb project initially under a contract with the Navy, then with the Office of Scientific Research and Development, then with the Manhattan Engineering District, and finally with the Atomic Energy Commission. Other important war activities were an extensive underwater sound research and development program, the operation of the Naval Midshipmen's School from which were graduated over 21,000 line officers, the Naval School of Military Government, and a substantial medical research effort concentrated almost entirely at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in New York City.

With the cessation of hostilities in 1945, the return to the normal educational function of the university required a reduction in Government research. To accomplish this, I, among others, advocated the transfer of the continuing major Manhattan Engineering District atomic energy research from Columbia to some associated group of interested eastern universities. I was named chairman of a committee to accomplish this end, and, as a result, the Brookhaven National Laboratory was established under the control of Associated Universities, Inc., of which I was the first treasurer.

On March 9, 1949, I was appointed treasurer of the trustees of Columbia University, and in June 1949 I became, in addition, vice president of the university.

All phases of the endowment management are the direct responsibility of the treasurer and include, among other things, all legal, maintenance, insurance, patent and accounting matters, and purchases and sales. During my active service at the Columbia University such purchases and sales of investments were approximately as follows:

In Government securities, \$284 million; in all other kinds of securities, \$110 million; in real estate, \$19 million; in mortgages, \$16 million.

In addition to my activities as university treasurer, my responsibility as vice president of the university included supervision of maintenance and construction relating to the university's academic plant, power system, athletic facilities and outlying laboratories, and the administration of non-academic personnel matters, labor relations, purchasing, and, in general, of all affairs of a business and legal nature.

The names of the present trustees of Columbia are as follows: M. Hartley Dodge, Willard V. Kling, Albert W. Putnam, Thomas J.

Watson, George E. Warren, Thomas I. Parkinson, John G. Jackson, George L. Harrison, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Adrian M. Massie, Frank D. Fackenthal, Walter D. Fletcher, Douglas M. Black, William S. Paley, Robert W. Watt, Maurice T. Moore, Dr. John J. H. Keating, the Reverend John Heuss, Jr., Vermont Hatch, Grayson Kirk, Felix E. Wormser, Thomas W. Chrystie, and Lester D. Egbert.

On December 8, 1941, I became a trustee of the Central Savings Bank of New York, a mutual institution with deposits of about \$380 million and about 170,000 depositors.

The other trustees of the bank are James G. Blaine, Lucius D. Clay, Cleo F. Craig, Robert A. Drysdale, Eugene Hennigson, James L. Lee, John Lowry, James A. McLain, Ralph T. Reed, Frederick M. Schall, Otto Strippel, Herbert J. Stursberg, and Louis Watjen.

The bank's committee on investments, of which I have been a member with Mr. Blaine, Mr. Drysdale, and Mr. Lee, approved, during the period of my active service (June 8, 1942, to July 27, 1953) total Government bond purchases and sales amounting approximately to \$1,400,000,000, and other bond transactions totaling about \$52 million.

During the period January 11, 1943, to July 27, 1953, I served continuously with Mr. Lee, Mr. Lowry, and Mr. Stursberg as a member of the bank's committee on mortgages and real estate, when we approved the purchase of 542 FHA-insured mortgage loans for about \$41 million; 1,381 VA-guaranteed mortgage loans for about \$13,500,000; and other loans for approximately \$61 million.

During most of my active service as a trustee, I was chairman of the bank's examining committee, supervising the annual audit of the institution's affairs as required by the State banking department.

On April 28, 1950, I was elected and continue as a trustee of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, a mutual insurance company with assets of \$415 million, serving the staffs of approximately 650 colleges, universities, and other institutions, generally of an educational nature. The names of the other trustees of this organization are as follows: Roger Adams, H. M. Addinsell, James S. Alexander, Charles W. Cole, Ralph E. Himstead, Richard M. Hurd, John I. Kirkpatrick, Cloyd Laporte, R. McAllister Lloyd, Milton T. MacDonald, Norman A. M. MacKenzie, Joseph B. Maclean, James M. Nicely, Francis T. P. Plimpton, Earl B. Schwulst, Sumner H. Slichter, Earle S. Thompson, Franklin B. Tuttle, and Joseph H. Willits.

From April 28, 1950, until July 27, 1953, I was continuously a member of the association's committee on mortgages and real estate, the other regular members being Mr. Schwulst, Mr. Laporte, and Mr. Lloyd. Transactions approved during that period included the following investments; the amounts are approximate: FHA-insured loans, \$63 million; VA-guaranteed loans, \$9,500,000; conventional mortgages, \$40 million; real estate, \$5,600,000.

From time to time I was a member of other committees of this organization.

In addition to these two principal activities outside the university, I serve as a director—without committee assignment—of the American Re-Insurance Co. and the American Reserve Insurance Co. to which boards I was elected on January 28, 1942, and February 23, 1950, respectively. In the past I was a director of the Lincoln Building Corp. and the McComb Estate Corp. Otherwise my corporate connections have, or have had, to do with my Columbia office or family responsibilities.

At present I am acting as trustee of certain trusts as a result of personal relationships or in connection with my university work.

In public service, I am a life trustee of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., a member of the committee on education of the New York State Chamber of Commerce, a trustee of the Manhattanville Neighborhood Center,

and of the House of the Holy Comforter, both of New York City, and for some years was the treasurer and a director of the Alumni Federation of Columbia University.

As a consultant to the Department of Defense, I was a member, during 1951 and 1952, of that Department's Committee on Contracts With Educational Institutions; and during 1952 and 1953, a member of its Commission on Hazardous Duty and Incentive Pays for the Armed Services. I was sworn in as a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission on July 27, 1953, for an unexpired term ending June 30, 1955.

After a year with the Commission, I became convinced that my particular experience and abilities could be better applied to Columbia and the other activities to which I have referred. Accordingly, I advised the President that I wished to leave the Commission on or before November 30, 1954. He then asked me to accept my present post, subject to Senate confirmation. I took office as Comptroller General of the United States on December 14, 1954, by recess appointment.

In this connection I should like to draw your attention to the circumstances leading up to this appointment.

During the past summer I reached the conclusion that it would be best if I returned to private life as soon as possible—preferably by early fall. I did not have an opportunity to discuss this directly with the President until September 20 when I tendered my resignation as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Whereupon the President asked that I consider the Comptroller General post. Since he had not previously intimated that this request would be made of me, it was not until September 30 that I was able to reach a decision and, on that day, I accepted.

In the few brief discussions I have had in this matter, prior to and since my appointment, neither the President nor any member of his staff has sought or has received my views, nor have they expressed to me their views, with respect to the Office of the Comptroller General or to the organization and operation of the General Accounting Office.

If I may, I wish now to give you this first expression of my concept of the place of the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office in our system of government.

Anyone engaging in public accounting or in certain kinds of legal work must have a general understanding of the organization and methods of the General Accounting Office. This was my experience during the period from 1924 to 1941. Thereafter, when with Columbia, in devoting the greater part of my time to Government matters, it was even more essential for me to be informed of not only the day-to-day decisions of the Comptroller General, but also to understand the particular function of the General Accounting Office in contracting and operating arrangements.

As a result, I came to my present Office with a wholesome regard for its staff, its procedures, and its integrity. In my opinion, this agency of the Congress today commands the high respect of the business community and the confidence of the public.

During recent weeks I have been reviewing the history of the General Accounting Office and its relationship to the legislative and executive branches of the Government. While there undoubtedly are views to the contrary, I personally am clear in my own mind that in enacting the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the Congress intended that this Office be the agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government. There has been considerable discussion on this point over the years by students of government; nevertheless, the Congress emphasized upon enactment of the Reorganization Acts of 1945 and 1949, and

again at the time of enactment of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, that the General Accounting Office is a part of the legislative branch. I believe that it is the only proper status for the Office, if it is, in fact, to be an independent agency of the Congress.

It cannot be under the control of, or responsible to, either the President or the executive branch. To be effective in discharging the functions imposed upon them by law, the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office must remain responsible to the Congress. At the same time, it must be recognized that the Office has a duty to cooperate with the executive branch to improve accounting, auditing, and financial reporting throughout the Government, as well as to work closely with the executive branch on other matters to improve economy and efficiency in Government operations.

The Comptroller General must be completely nonpartisan in his work. His reports to the Congress and others must be factual and fair. There must be a full disclosure of all matters, letting the chips fall where they may. It is the duty of the Comptroller General to enforce strictly the laws enacted by the Congress insofar as they relate to financial matters. If such enacted laws are either difficult of compliance from an administrative viewpoint or result in inequities, it is obviously the responsibility of the Congress to make whatever changes it may deem necessary. It, of course, is not within the power of the Comptroller General to modify a law by interpretation.

As the agent of the Congress, it is the responsibility of the Comptroller General, with the General Accounting Office, to render all possible service to the Congress and its committees in the form of reports and assistance. I understand this function was developed extensively during the past 10 years by my esteemed predecessor. It would be my intention to continue to emphasize and to develop this phase of the organization's function.

The CHAIRMAN. That concludes your prepared statement, Mr. Campbell?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the generous remarks of the able senior Senator from Iowa, in saying that he concedes that those of us who oppose confirmation of the nomination are sincere.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I know the Senator from Tennessee is sincere, although I happen to disagree with him. That, however, does not go to the question of the distinguished Senator's sincerity.

Mr. GORE. I was about to add that that remark is typical of the Senator from Iowa. He is always generous in conceding to his fellow Senators the sincerity of their views; he always takes that position. I appreciate it, and I wish to say that I enjoy working with the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

I, too, conceded, in the course of my remarks, that Mr. Campbell has had a distinguished career. For that, I applaud him. However, the experience he has had would not, I take it, qualify him—according to the view of the senior Senator from Iowa—for appointment to the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I may answer the Senator from Tennessee, I shall not refer to any appointments of individuals at any time to the Supreme Court, but I will say that there are per-

sons who have been proposed for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States who I thought were not qualified; and from the standpoint of judgment, commonsense, and interpretative ability, I would say that Joe Campbell would be far better qualified to serve the country on the Supreme Court of the United States, even though he is not a lawyer, than would some persons who have been proposed, but have not been appointed to that Court. In that connection, I refer to no one who has been appointed to the Court.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. That may well be. I brought up that question only because I have previously said that there are positions in the Government with respect to which I would gladly support the nomination of Mr. Campbell; but there are positions in the Government for which I believe he lacks the essential qualifications.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I appreciate the Senator's view, and I respect his view. He is sincere. I am not attempting to do anything to detract from his position. As I stated a moment ago, frankly, I happen to disagree with him, but I think we can disagree without difficulty.

I wish to discuss for a moment the question of legal training. Much has been made of the fact that Mr. Campbell is not a trained lawyer, that he does not possess a law degree. However, I suggest that during the past 30 years his experience as an accountant and a layman qualifies him for this position. Today accountants appear before boards and bureaus of the Government in connection with delicate and technical legal matters. They are not admitted to the practice of law, as a rule, but they are acknowledged to possess the ability to deal with legal questions. They have a knowledge of the legal phases of their profession which entitles them to appear as advocates on behalf of clients before boards and bureaus of the Government.

When the criticism is made that Mr. Campbell is not a lawyer, I reply that the most momentous decisions in the world today are made by the President of the United States. They involve most serious and fundamental legal problems; and yet the President of the United States is not a lawyer and does not claim to be a lawyer. He is a man of judgment. He is a man capable of listening to advice from skilled technical and professional advisers, and acting upon the advice which he receives, but he is not a lawyer.

The Secretary of the Navy does not have to be a lawyer, but he must pass upon contracts. He takes the advice of the technically able counselors in his Department.

The number of contracts which the Atomic Energy Commission enters into each year runs into literally hundreds of thousands, yet no member of the Atomic Energy Commission at this time is a lawyer. Nor is it thought absolutely essential that any member be a lawyer.

There are many scores, if not hundreds, of lawyers on the staff.

There are between 100 and 150 lawyers in the General Accounting Office. The Deputy Comptroller General is a lawyer. With between 100 and 150 lawyers in the agency, if the necessary technical and legal advice is not available to the Comptroller General, I do not know how it could be obtained.

Today there is no man living who could head one of the vast departments of Government and personally pass upon the legal problems which arise almost every minute. No one has the capacity to do it.

The heads of the great industries of this country, whose very business life depends upon the legality of the performance of their contracts, in many cases are not lawyers. It does not require a lawyer to be the head of a departmental agency. Every agency of the Government is involved every day in the interpretation and application of legal principles to the business of government. There are lawyers on the staffs of the various departments to advise the heads of those departments.

Let us get back to the Atomic Energy Commission. Probably there is no more vital scientific, technical, and production agency in Government today than the Atomic Energy Commission, with all its activities. Yet it does not require a man highly schooled in science, engineering, or anything else, to be a good Commissioner. I think it is well to recognize some of the various branches of our economy on that Commission, but it is not essential, because in the scientific field there is a general advisory committee, consisting of the top scientists of the country, to advise the Commission, which is a commission of laymen. The members of the Commission must make up their minds based upon good commonsense and sound judgment.

Today there is not an engineer on the Commission; and none is necessary. I would not object to a member of the Commission being an engineer if I thought he had commonsense as well as engineering training in the particular category. But it is not essential, because there are technical boards of engineers to give advice in that field.

So it is with the General Accounting Office. A man who knows finance, who knows the operations incident to the expenditure of public funds, needs only commonsense and a willingness to take advantage of the technical advice in fields in which he is not technically trained. In effect, our great universities are public bodies, so far as concerns their investments and their operations. A man who is familiar with such operations, and who has had broad experience with government, needs only commonsense to avail himself of the technical advice in fields with which he is not familiar.

If the Comptroller General undertakes to inspect procedures involving the expenditure of funds in the Navy Department, must he know navigation? Must he know how to operate a zonar set? Must he know how to fire electronically the big guns?

If he goes into the Air Force to inspect the application of public moneys appropriated to the Air Force, must he know how to fly a jet fighter? It seems to me that the fallacy of the argument, with all due respect to those who advance it, that because he does not happen to be a lawyer he is disqualified for this position, must be patent.

We need a man of consistent courage, ability, and honesty. Not a word of aspersion against the honesty or integrity of this man has been uttered on the floor, and I am quite sure that Senators who object to his nomination have no thought of impugning his integrity or honesty.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who spoke against the confirmation of this nomination, affirmatively reiterated that point; and he is sincere. It has been affirmatively admitted on the floor of the Senate by the opponents of Mr. Campbell's nomination that he is a man of great ability and experience.

We next come to the argument that he will not represent the interests of the Congress of the United States. Again I say that I do not wish to create the impression or leave the connotation that I believe that those who object to him on that ground are impugning his integrity, because I do not think they mean to do so. However, in effect, when the charge is made that Joseph Campbell, whose honor has not been impugned, and who, through every acquaintance he ever made, can produce testimony that his integrity is inviolate, if he assumes the obligations of this office will not discharge the duties of the office sincerely, honestly, and decently in the interest of the Congress, those who make the charge in fact, impugn his honor and integrity.

Again I say that I am utterly certain that those who use that argument have no intention whatsoever of attempting to create that impression. But that is the effect of it. They say, "Here is a man who is admittedly honest now but if he assumes the responsibilities and obligations of public service, he will not discharge them honestly and in contemplation of law."

If that is not an imputation against the honor and integrity of an individual, who otherwise has never had his honor and integrity impugned, then I do not know what it is.

I cannot repeat too often that I do not believe the argument is used for that purpose at all. However, it has that implication. That is the interpretation that could be put on such a statement.

Let us now consider the argument that this is an Executive appointment. The law itself prescribes how the Comptroller General shall be nominated and appointed. The law says that the President shall appoint the Comptroller General, with the advice and consent of the Senate. That is, technically, the President nominates the Comptroller General, and the Senate advises and consents to his appointment, as in other cases of Executive appointments.

Therefore, the statute passed by Congress provides that the President shall

nominate the Comptroller General and appoint him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Has there been any deviation from that practice in this instance?

The argument is made that Congress should have something to say about it initially. There is nothing in the law that so provides. What mechanism has been created whereby Congress can name the Comptroller General? None whatever.

Is it to be argued that a couple of leaders on each side of the aisle in the Senate shall get together and name the Comptroller General and the President shall appoint the person they agree upon? I do not happen to be in that leadership. However, I have something to say about such an appointment, as does every other Member on both sides of the aisle.

The Librarian of Congress is supposed to be a servant of Congress. Yet the law provides that he shall be nominated by the President of the United States.

These questions have been discussed and the same arguments have been advanced heretofore, but they have always been discarded as unworkable and impracticable. Are we to have a caucus in the Senate of Republican Members and a caucus of Democratic Members? Are we to have a caucus in the House of Representatives of the Republican Representatives and a caucus of the Democratic Representatives?

Are we to run teams of candidates for these offices? Are we to select candidates whom the President shall appoint? I think not. I believe no one will argue for that kind of procedure or contend that that should be done.

The responsibility for nominations rests with the President. The responsibility for advising and consenting rests with the Senate. Thereafter the President may appoint.

Certainly the Comptroller General is a servant and agent of the Congress and of the interests of the public in seeing to it that public moneys are properly expended.

I wish to suggest that the questions which have been raised with reference to the Comptroller General are not new questions. The question of providing proper safeguards for the administration of public funds is not something which has come into existence during the past 20 or 30 years. It goes back to the 12th or 13th century. Quite a history of it has been compiled by the Chief of Investigations of the General Accounting Office.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an address entitled "The Power of the Purse," delivered by Mr. W. L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations of the General Accounting Office, at the Hillsdale (Mich.) College annual alumni dinner in 1954. It is a succinct and very lucid discussion of the historic background and development of what we now call the comptroller system of public finance in our Government and in the government of England.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF THE PURSE

(Speech by W. L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations of the U. S. General Accounting Office, at the Hillsdale (Mich.) College annual alumni dinner, 1954)

When we speak of the power of the purse, we mean the control by Congress on the amount and purposes of the spending of the public's money. It is our doctrine that this is Congress' first business, the one real power upon which all other legislative work depends for its effectiveness—the one which most directly benefits you as a citizen and a taxpayer if it is used well, and most severely hurts everyone if it is used badly. In fact, the view is held that the control of public funds historically is the basic reason we have a representative legislature as an inherent institution of a free government.

The function we are talking about did not spring full-blown from the mind of the lawgiver. It became settled only after centuries of internecine conflict, some of it very bitter indeed. Our system being modeled very closely after the English system, with which the framers were familiar, let us refer for a moment to what it was.

Through the centuries of the Middle Ages no problem arose on what could or should be done with the sovereign revenue, with perhaps 1 or 2 untypical exceptions. The first form of English appropriation is understood to have been authorized in 1348 for the defense against the Scots, and in 1353 for the furtherance of the border wars then in progress. Again, when Henry IV was asked to render accounts of the extraordinary supply voted him for military use, his answer was, "Kings do not render accounts." But these efforts were the exceptions; and the reason is this: There was no treasury apart from the King's own purse. His ordinary expenses of government were paid from the revenues of his private lands and feudal rights. When further and extraordinary aids were voted him by the barons, and later by Parliament, they became the King's funds, subject only to the royal prerogative. It is true that certain reference can be found in Magna Carta to the already felt doctrine that taxation without common consent is illegal, a doctrine restated in the Petition of Right in 1628, and finally affirmed in the Bill of Rights later in that same century.

But parliamentary control of the spending of the royal revenue, as distinguished from raising it, is the story of the 17th century—the years of revolution in the mother country. Under the Tudor kings, Parliament hardly dared to meddle with such matters, but the stronger Parliament of 1624 set a precedent in an appropriation for extraordinary supplies that the money should be paid not to the King or to the Chancellor of the Exchequer but into the hands of commissioners named by the Parliament. This happened again in 1641 and during the interregnum it became an easy and comfortable adjustment to have the national finances managed by a parliamentary committee. Five years later, when a very large sum was needed for the Dutch war, a clause inserted in the bill called for the money to be spent only for the purposes of that war. After the revolution of 1689 and with the great powers dedicated to Parliament by the declaration of rights and the bill of rights, a simple insertion in the law, limiting the money voted to the purpose for which appropriated, became the custom and then the rule. Under the same influence came the new limit on the size of the standing army, and the statute necessary to furnish it with funds and provisions was carefully limited to an annual vote, good for 1 year only. Per-

haps that background is why it is said: "In fact, most scholars are now agreed that, although the knights and the burgesses could be useful to the King in acting as his agents and giving occasional advice on matters of importance to local government, the Crown's need of money was the most immediate reason for summoning representatives of the counties and towns to Parliament."

In brief, what called Parliament together from time to time at the King's writ was his need for money; what Parliament did to make its voice effective was to enact a control not merely on the raising of money but on its spending.

With that background, it is not surprising that the English colonists in the New World, in their colonial assemblies, used effectively the power of the purse in their struggle for power with the royal governors. A writer named Charles Bullock says:

"Nothing stands out with greater distinctness than the persistence and success with which the colonists insisted upon the right of their legislative assemblies to direct their finances. This side of colonial history is so familiar that we can assume the facts of the separation of powers and the establishment of legislative control of the finances."

I think also that background explains why the basic provision in the Constitution on this subject was adopted with so little controversy. I could not find it even mentioned in the Federalist papers. What the Constitution says, very simply, is this: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Now, to give force to this generality, Congress, over a hundred years ago, supplemented the Constitution by a series of statutes providing:

First. All money received from any source for the use of the Government must be deposited into the Treasury.

Second. Once appropriated by the Congress, the public funds may be used only for the purposes for which appropriated.

Third. Except in the case of supplies for the soldiers, no contract may be made to bind the Treasury unless—according to the neat language of that time—it is under "an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment."

Fourth. No Department may expend more than the amount appropriated for the current year.

To carry out the system of controls so provided, the primary machinery, of course, is the President's budgetary program and the annual Congressional review and passage of the money bills. The latter responsibility falls almost entirely upon a most hardworking and effective branch of the Congress, namely, the Appropriations Committees. Their hearings are continuous, long, and arduous. Their staple diet is the book of estimates, a mass of tedious figures. Their work is quite without glamor—their meetings without publicity. It is not for them to receive acclaim by raising estimates and granting benevolences. Rather, theirs is the unpopular task to cut down, to deny, to withdraw, to refuse—sometimes at great political risk—the enormous pressures of the interested groups, and most of all the spending department, whose plea it is that the pillars of the Republic will fall if their budget is cut.

The great change in recent years in the appropriation process is the shift from specific detailed appropriations of relatively small amounts to broadly worded provision of general funds in large amounts, often hundreds of millions of dollars, for a single purpose—such as projects for rural rehabilitation, loans for public works, and the like. This leaves to the President and the departments much of the policy on how the money is to be spent and for what. In turn, this calls for a great improvement in another

legislative function, namely, the oversight or surveillance of administration. This may happen through committee hearings and investigations, through appropriation cuts the following year, and finally through our own work in the General Accounting Office, which is a part of the legislative branch and exists—in short terms—to try to see that the Government's fiscal business gets run right.

The first of these methods of congressional surveillance is the investigation process of the Congress itself or its committees. That story is a long one, and you will be relieved to hear that it must await another occasion. But it may be of interest to remind you that the earliest congressional investigation, in 1792, related to the spending of public money in this area (Michigan) and it examined into the military expedition of General St. Clair into the Northwest Territory, and into charges of waste, mismanagement, and failure.

The Government's accounting office has been in business since 1789 but under different names and always subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury until 1921. During those years, what can be described as "a paper audit" was thought to be enough; that is, an examination of the papers and vouchers submitted to justify the expenditure of funds, on the presumption that the vouchers truly stated the facts. No deficiencies were felt in that form of check-up.

In the great budgetary reform of 1921 which resulted from a study set up by President Taft, and from the hard lessons of the war years, the accounting office was removed from the executive branch, put under a new officer, the Comptroller General of the United States, who though named by the President is subject to dismissal only by joint resolution of the Congress and whose work is not subject to the direction of any other officer. Accounting and auditing activities, further strengthened by the act of 1950, are directed ultimately toward (a) assisting departments and agencies in meeting their express responsibilities for the establishment of appropriate and meaningful accounting systems and (b) comprehensive analyses of agency operations to determine the extent to which accounting and related financial reporting provide the needs of both Congress and management and an effective control over Government assets.

For the first time, too, the act of 1921 tells us to investigate, at the seat of Government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds. We are told to dig out the facts. When an investigation is required, our Office of Investigations is called in. We have a small staff located at 30 different points in this country and 3 points in Europe; and we have a few investigators covering the Far East on travel assignment.

The subject matters investigated are limited only by the broad generality of the language quoted above. For example, they may cover allegations of wasteful and extravagant procedures and expenditures; departmental activities not authorized by the law; failure to collect sums due the Government or the use of collections without authority; fraudulent or otherwise irregular purchases; excess spending for property and equipment; manifest overstaffing; unauthorized facilities; unnecessary, ineffective, or overlapping activities; undercharges for services supplied and sold; dissipation of property through neglect; unjustified allowances granted; or any other erroneous condition reflecting inattention to the public interest. We may examine into the purpose for which money was spent or the method by which it was used, and specific findings in one area may lead to widespread investigation of similar matters in other areas and agencies.

The results of this work are sent in the form of reports to the departments whose

job it is to do something about them and, when necessary or requested, the reports may be sent to the Congress or the committees, where they very frequently form the basis of congressional hearings. Some few specific examples are briefed in the Comptroller General's annual report to Congress, such as our reports on PMA grain warehouse losses and defalcations, veterans' training under the GI bill, extravagant construction of housing for foreign service employees in Germany, dual staffing in military and civilian positions, year-end procurement to obligate available funds, and timber sale practices in the national forests and public lands.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am interested in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio with regard to this nomination and with reference to the fact that the General Accounting Office is an agent of the legislative branch of the Government. I was interested, in that connection, to read the statement Mr. Campbell made on that point to the committee:

While there undoubtedly are views to the contrary, I personally am clear in my own mind that in enacting the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the Congress intended that this office be the agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

It seems to me that statement clarifies the situation. It makes it clear that Mr. Campbell feels the position is not a part of the executive or any other branch of the Government, except the legislative branch.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I had no intention to discuss this subject at such great length. I shall conclude my remarks by referring to the suggestion made this afternoon that Mr. Campbell has had no experience in the administration of the legislative interests of the Government.

Let me say that if that argument were valid, then no human being in the United States could run for the United States Senate for the first time, because he would have had no previous experience in the Senate.

No lawyer, regardless of how successful he might be in the practice of law, could be placed on the bench of his State or on the Federal bench, if he had never been a judge, because he would have had no experience as a judge.

In public office 2 or 3 requirements are essential. One is the realization that a public office is a public trust. In keeping with that realization, another requirement is an inviolate integrity on the part of the incumbent. I would consider a most desirable and essential requirement, ability. If I had to differentiate among these qualifications, I would probably put ability third, because, in my opinion, the realization that a public office is a public trust and the inviolate integrity of an individual are the fundamental essentials. We can usually find the ability that goes along with those two qualifications.

In this case I am convinced, from association with this man, that he has a full realization that a public office

is a public trust and that he knows that the Comptroller General is a servant of the Congress whose duty it is to assure the proper application of the funds which the representatives of the people vote for their Government. I am also convinced that Mr. Campbell is a man of the highest integrity, because not only has no one questioned it, but the record is replete with testimony as to his integrity. Furthermore, his ability and experience cannot be questioned.

Mr. President, I regret that there are some who sincerely and genuinely feel they must object to this appointment. I thoroughly disagree that they have any grounds upon which to object, either on the basis of integrity or ability or a realization on the nominee's part that the position of Comptroller General is primarily one of service to the Congress in supervising the application of the funds appropriated by the Congress. I feel it is an appointment worthy of the high requirements of the office. Probably in connection with no appointment or very few is there unanimity of opinion. Some people may honestly in their own minds disagree. In this case I consider that the appointment is one of which the Congress will eventually be proud—that of a man who will serve in the highest traditions of the Office and will discharge the duties of the Office with high integrity, great ability, and a deep sense of responsibility.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long in speaking with reference to this appointment. But I wish to emphasize 2 or 3 points because of my close experience with the Comptroller General's office.

Before I became a Member of this body I was a member of the other body for 14 years, and during that time I served on the House Committee on Government Operations. During that time on three occasions, I was chairman of a subcommittee which worked very closely with the office of the Comptroller General. No one had greater respect for the immediate predecessor of Mr. Campbell than did I. Lindsay Warren was indeed a fine man who endeavored to do, and did do, a good job.

The question of politics was brought up in the discussion by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee and in the colloquy which took place between him and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. Campbell may have made rather remotely some mention of politics in a letter.

There have been only three Comptrollers General before Mr. Campbell. The first was J. Raymond McCarl. Among the things listed in Mr. McCarl's biography is the fact that he was executive secretary of the National Republican Congressional Committee. So, obviously, he had some political contact, and he was formerly private secretary to the late great Senator George Norris.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will permit me, I am aware of the statement referred to a while ago to the

effect that Mr. Campbell said there should be political responsibility to the President on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission. I am familiar with that statement. I think I understand its connotation. I believe he meant that this is a political government, not a Republican or a Democratic government, and that the responsibility for a political government in its administration must necessarily from time to time head up with the chief executive officer of the Government, who is the President, and that an administrative department should have, in the broadest sense of the word, political responsibility, that it should not be an agency running all over the map on projects of its own, but should be coordinated with the administrative program and administrative accomplishments. I think it was in the broadest possible sense that Mr. Campbell used the word "political."

Mr. BENDER. I am very grateful to the Senator for his comment and for emphasizing what was in Mr. Campbell's mind when he wrote the letter to which reference has been made.

I wish to say, further, that the second Comptroller General, Fred Herbert Brown, was a Presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Wilson and Marshall. So, obviously, he was versed in the ways of politics.

I know his predecessor, Mr. McCarl, was an active partisan. Mr. McCarl was a Republican and Mr. Brown was a Democrat.

Mr. Lindsay Warren had vast political experience. He was a delegate to the Democratic national conventions in 1932 and 1940. He was chairman of the State conventions in 1930 and 1934, and was temporary chairman and key-noteur—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator refer to national conventions?

Mr. BENDER. State conventions in his home State of North Carolina. These men were active in their own parties, but that did not influence one iota their service in the important position of Comptroller General. Lindsay Warren did an excellent job, even though he was an active Democrat and an active partisan. He performed his duties extremely well, although in a few instances he made some mistakes. In the 80th Congress I was chairman of a committee which investigated the Comptroller General's office. I am sure Lindsay Warren would be the first to agree with my statement that in the General Accounting Office things were going on which were not altogether businesslike. The committee was not a headline-hunting committee. It was a committee which had in its membership the now majority leader of the House of Representatives, JOHN McCORMACK, and several other eminent Representatives. We discussed the accounting methods of the Comptroller General's Office and brought about many reforms in that Office.

So even so good a man as was Lindsay Warren made some mistakes during his tenure of office.

It has been emphasized that the Comptroller General's Office is an agency of the Congress. It is. The Comptroller General is directly responsible to the Congress. But the fact that the nominee is a businessman and a certified public accountant should not militate against him, particularly when it is recognized that accounting has much to do with the position to which he has been appointed.

The fact that he was confirmed by this body to serve on the Atomic Energy Commission, which is highly important so far as the national welfare is concerned, certainly should not militate against him.

No one questions his integrity; no one questions any aspect of his official work as a servant of Columbia University or of his contacts with the Federal Government and Federal agencies. The office of Comptroller General requires a man who has had business experience. If a nominee for this office had been a delegate to a Democratic or a Republican convention it certainly should not militate against him. But that is not true in this case. Mr. Campbell, so far as I know, has not been active politically. In fact, that is one thing I hold against him. I like people who are active in politics.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. He has been much less of a politician than have his predecessors; is not that correct?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. He has not mixed in politics at all until he received this appointment.

Mr. BENDER. That is my impression.

Mr. LANGER. Which may be a very good thing.

Mr. BENDER. I think so. It may be an advantage not to have been active in any political organization, since he will occupy a position as the watchdog of the Treasury for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. In examining the proceedings held before the Committee on Government Operations, I was impressed by the fact that Columbia University is one of the largest universities in the world.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LANGER. My recollection is that Columbia owns some of the very finest property in New York City, property which occupies 4 or 5 blocks. Rockefeller Center, I believe, is located on some of the property of Columbia University.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. It probably receives revenue amounting to millions of dollars annually.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the observation of my good friend from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly a few years ago it was the largest university in the United States.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Ohio know of any time when there was

any scandal connected with the administrative or financial affairs of Columbia University, with which Mr. Campbell was connected?

Mr. BENDER. Having been a member of the Committee on Government Operations, which passed upon Mr. Campbell's qualifications, I can say there is nothing in his record, private, official, or in any other way, which indicates that he is anything but an honorable gentleman, who is highly qualified to perform this very important service for the United States Congress and the taxpayers.

Mr. LANGER. Moreover, Mr. Campbell is a certified public accountant, is he not?

Mr. BENDER. He is a certified public accountant, which certainly should not militate against him in the consideration by the Senate of his nomination.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. To be qualified to serve as Comptroller General, one would need to be a certified public accountant just as much as he would need to be a good administrator, would he not?

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is 100 percent correct.

Mr. THYE. In order that the Comptroller General may be enabled to understand the field of investigational work in connection with the appropriation and expenditure of public funds he must be a certified public accountant. If he has that qualification, the legal aspects of the position can be studied and acquired later.

I think the person whose nomination is before the Senate for confirmation, Mr. Joseph Campbell, has the qualifications which can assure Congress that he is eminently fitted to examine and determine whether funds which have been authorized and appropriated by Congress have been properly expended.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the observation of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota. I have no quarrel with lawyers. I think the Government and the Senate need lawyers.

Mr. LANGER. The Senate needs farmers, too.

Mr. BENDER. The membership of the Senate comprises good farmers, good lawyers, and good businessmen.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that for many years Columbia University has conducted a course in business administration in its School of Business.

Mr. BENDER. I may say to my good friend from North Dakota that Columbia University has one of the outstanding business schools in the world.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding, further, that there have been thousands of graduates from the Columbia University School of Business.

Mr. BENDER. That is true; and they comprise many persons who now occupy some of the outstanding positions in Government and the business world.

Mr. LANGER. My understanding, further, is that the Columbia University School of Business is closely allied with the Harvard University School of Business.

Mr. BENDER. That is exactly correct; there has been a very close relation-

ship between the two schools for many decades.

Mr. LANGER. It is further my understanding that the board of trustees of Columbia University is comprised of persons of outstanding business experience.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LANGER. So when the university was searching for an assistant treasurer, the trustees of Columbia, most of whom, I assume, were residents of New York, and had had an opportunity to observe the thousands upon thousands of graduates of their business school, were able to select from among those persons one who would make a good assistant treasurer, and they selected Mr. Campbell.

Mr. BENDER. I am certain that the observation made by the Senator from North Dakota is entirely in order, and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, when he was appointed assistant treasurer, it was with the understanding that his predecessor planned to resign in a short time and that Mr. Campbell would succeed him as treasurer.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. When that time came, the board of trustees, who are businessmen, and had the advantage of being intimately acquainted with thousands upon thousands of other good businessmen, did not even select one of the graduates of the Columbia University School of Business; instead, they picked Mr. Campbell because of his very outstanding record as a business administrator.

Mr. BENDER. There is no question about his ability. As a matter of fact, I believe the President of the United States could not have selected, from anywhere in the country, a person better qualified and equipped for this particular position.

As I have said, while I was a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I had close contact with the Office of the Comptroller General. I know something about the operations of the Office and of the qualifications which are necessary for a person to head that Office and to do a good job.

I feel certain that Members of Congress in both Houses will be proud of the decision which I hope the Senate will make today to confirm the nomination of Joseph Campbell.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENDER. I have finished.

Mr. LANGER. I would not concede for a moment that Mr. Campbell is the best person who could have been selected for the position because I know there are many other persons, in Maine, North Dakota, Ohio, and other States, who could fulfill the requirements of the office of Comptroller General. I would not say that Mr. Campbell is the best person who could have been nominated, but certainly, based on the record, it seems that he is an outstanding man—one who will do a very good job.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate sincerely the contribution of the Senator from North Dakota.

I hope and trust that the Senate will act immediately to confirm the nomination, and I hope that even my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] will leave the mourners' bench and join with us in doing this good work.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I intend to speak for only a very few minutes, and I do so because the question has been raised as to the qualifications of Joseph Campbell, whose nomination for the office of Comptroller General is under consideration by this body.

If we were to undertake to follow the criterion suggested by one of the speakers today as the basis upon which the office of Comptroller General should be filled, then we would bar from that office three Members of this body, I can think of at the moment, who probably possess the greatest knowledge concerning the interpretation of appropriation acts and the manner in which the moneys of the Government should be expended so as to express the will of the Congress. I refer to three Senators who are not lawyers, and who would not qualify in that respect. One of them is my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges]. Another is the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. Another is the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]. All three of them have played very important parts in handling matters before the Appropriations Committee. Yet they are neither accountants nor lawyers.

Mr. President, my reason for speaking, briefly, is that I think I do have some knowledge of the qualifications needed for the particular office under discussion. It so happens that I have been privileged to serve in a similar capacity—on a smaller scale, I will admit, but in a very similar capacity—and I, too, am not a lawyer, and do not possess that title behind my name. But I am an accountant, and I recognize the great value that an accountant can bring to the office of Comptroller General.

I may say that if, during many years of the past, the Members of this body and the Members of the House of Representatives had paid a little more heed to the urgings of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] with respect to financial accounting and other monetary problems which have confronted the Nation, we would be in far better shape, from a fiscal standpoint, than we are today.

I may say that if Mr. Campbell could make no other contribution than to go into the office of Comptroller General, admirably qualified as he is, and make a comprehensive study and evaluation of the accounting systems which are presently in use at the Federal level, and submit to Congress specific recommendations which would pinpoint the loopholes that currently exist—and we are not getting factual reporting and accounting of value to the Congress in determining the needs of the administration in carrying out its program—then he would be making in that field alone a very great contribution toward putting

the fiscal house of the Federal Government in order. When fiscal reports are made we should be able to have confidence that they are actual, factual, and sound.

I am referring especially to the manner in which unobligated balances of appropriations are reported. There is no uniform or systematic way of making such reports. One department reports such balances on one basis. Another department—say the Defense Department—reports them on another basis. We can go down the line and find that the departments give figures today which in 2 weeks will be out of balance by millions of dollars.

No, Mr. President, we are not getting the type of fiscal reporting and accounting the country needs in order properly to evaluate and carry out a performance program in keeping with the budget which is sent to the Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I take it the distinguished Senator may have referred to the remarks I made, in which I set forth what I consider should be the qualifications of the Comptroller General.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator is correct. I was referring to the Senator's comment that he did not believe Mr. Campbell was qualified because the office under consideration is quasi-judicial in character, and therefore one filling that office should be an attorney in order to be able properly to interpret the meaning of the appropriation bills passed by the Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the remarks the distinguished Senator has made. I wish to say I regard him as one of the fine, able, and conscientious Members of the United States Senate. However, I should like to remind him that I used the following words in my remarks:

I believe that experience and background of a legal or legislative nature are essential.

Under those terms, the distinguished Members of this body to whom the able Senator referred would not be disqualified. I only undertook to point out that the nominee lacked experience either in the legislative or the judicial branches of the Government, or training in the legal field.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me say to my good friend the junior Senator from Tennessee that I appreciate fully the statement he made in that regard. Let me say further, because of the knowledge I believe I possess of this particular type of work and the kind of experience needed in such a position, that unless a person were exceptionally well grounded in the field of accounting and the practices that go with it, he would not be able to do what I have suggested should be done; namely, make recommendations concerning the action which should be taken both by the executive and the legislative branches of the Government to put into effect a uniform, effectual, and accurate system of accounting which would reflect true balances at all times, nor

would he be able to report to the Congress whether or not appropriations were being expended in keeping with the intent of Congress and in accordance with the history back of such appropriations.

Today we are not getting such reports, and Congress will never get them until there shall be established a unified system of accounting for the Government in all branches, so all departments will report and account for their money in the same manner. Otherwise, it is a loose-knit proposition. I can assure my colleague that no business or State government that is well organized and operated could possibly exist under the type of accounting system under which the Federal Government operates.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In my opinion, there is great merit in the statement which the distinguished Senator from Maine has just made. His statement, however, does not go to the essential qualifications of the office of Comptroller General. True, it would be well and good for the Comptroller General to have accounting experience, but I do not believe that qualification is as essential as are the other attributes which should be possessed by an incumbent of the office.

I wish to call to the able Senator's attention, with apologies for interrupting his able address, the Fifth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, 81st Congress. I read from that report:

The Comptroller General not only must decide questions which arise in connection with the carrying out of the duties of the General Accounting Office. He also is required, at the request of a disbursing or certifying officer or head of a department or establishment, to render a decision in advance of the legality of any proposed expenditure. The decision is binding on the General Accounting Office and on the officer or agency. Decisions of this kind are extremely important. They decide not only the propriety of individual payments but, often, the legality of entire programs. The Comptroller General makes certain that spending programs and financial transactions conform to the intent of the Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if I may say so—and I shall not go into the matter at any length—I think the Senator from Tennessee and I could better talk over this matter at some other time, because it would involve a long discussion. To the proposition what he has just mentioned I would seriously object; and I think any person who understands the fundamental principle would object to it also. I refer to having the Comptroller General under the structure established by the Congress act as a preaudit officer, on the one hand, and then, on the other hand, turn around and, as a postaudit officer, act on what he has previously given consent to. That is completely outside all the true concepts of the practice of accounting and auditing. One serves as a preaudit officer. The other serves as a postaudit officer. The Comptroller General is the postaudit officer of the United States Government, acting for the Congress, and he determines whether expenditures have been made in

accordance with the laws enacted by Congress.

The suggestion advanced would involve a long discussion. I shall be happy to discuss it at length with my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, at any time he may desire.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. PAYNE. I am very happy to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. Again, Mr. President, I think there is considerable merit in the position the able Senator from Maine has taken. However, I submit that the matter I read illustrates the necessity of the Comptroller General having more than auditing experience or capacity.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to interrupt for a moment, let me ask whether he has ever known a business corporation to employ a firm of lawyers to do auditing work as postauditors in determining whether the instructions of its board of directors have been faithfully and accurately carried out by the officers of the corporation. Or has the able Senator ever known a State to take similar action? In such cases, whom do they employ? They employ a firm of certified public accountants, trained and qualified by experience to do that type of work. I can assure my distinguished colleague that I speak from knowledge, because I have served in that capacity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield further to me?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I am very glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I am aware of that business practice, and I think it would be good for the Government. In fact, independent audits have been used by the Government.

But the case the Senator from Maine cited was that of a congressional committee which inquired of the Comptroller General about the legality of a proposed program.

I should like to point out to the able Senator from Maine that only last week, I, as chairman of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, was directed by the committee to invite the present Acting Comptroller General to come before the committee and give it his opinion as to the legality of the proposed highway legislation, now pending before the committee.

Mr. PAYNE. But he was not giving the committee an opinion upon a program which already has been placed in law.

Mr. GORE. No. By direction of the committee, I addressed to the Acting Comptroller General a letter—not having any bearing on the question of the confirmation of this nomination, I hope the Senator from Maine will believe—inviting him to come before the committee and give it his opinion as to the legality and feasibility of Senate bill 1160.

Just how the Acting Comptroller General can give such an opinion, I do not know. Perhaps he can, with the advice

of his counsel, pass on to the committee the composite of their opinions. But there may come a time when there is a disagreement between the legal counsel and the Comptroller General; and the law places upon the Comptroller General the responsibility for decision.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, after the law has taken effect, because I think my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, will agree that if we were not to proceed along that line, every bill or any bill which was before this body would then become the subject of appeal by us to the Supreme Court of the United States, with the request that the Court give us its opinion as to whether the bill we were considering, if enacted, would be good or bad, or could be carried out. In other words, that principle can be carried both ways.

If we wish to find out about proposed laws, let us see whether it will be appropriate to take each and every measure to the Supreme Court of the United States, to obtain its opinion. In the final analysis, the Court will be the tribunal which will interpret the law, and pass judgment on whether it is or is not constitutional.

The Comptroller General passes on the execution of the law, to determine whether the executive and administrative branches of the Government have properly carried out their responsibilities and have made their expenditures in keeping with the intent of the Congress in the enactment of the law.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Maine will concede, I take it, that Congress does need an agency upon whose advice it can depend as being independent of any ulterior motive—to advise it as to the legality of pending legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. That is true; and there is nothing wrong with having the Comptroller General give the Congress his advice, when requested to do so, as to his version of what the law may mean. But he will give it only about a measure which has not yet become a law. It is only after it becomes a law that he takes positive position for or against an action which occurs under the law.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield further, let me say I am enjoying this discussion, but I realize the Senator from Maine does not wish to prolong it. So I desire to act in accordance with his wish.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished majority leader, too, would like to be able to finish as soon as possible.

Mr. GORE. He keeps turning a weather eye upon me, as well as upon the Senator from Maine. So at this time I shall desist. I thank the able Senator from Maine for his indulgence.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I feel that in the person of Joseph Campbell we have a man who is admirably well qualified for the position of Comptroller General of the United States, and who, if his nomination is confirmed, will make a real contribution to the operations of that office.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE FEDERAL SECURITY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HARRY P. CAIN

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor. Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California desire to have the Senator from Minnesota yield to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, Mr. President; I merely had in mind suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be brief, and I do not believe it necessary to have a quorum call at this time.

Mr. President, I rise to bring to the attention of the Senate an outstanding address made this morning by the Honorable Harry P. Cain, former Member of this body, and a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. I ask unanimous consent to have the address entitled "Strong in Their Pride and Free," delivered before the seventh annual conference on civil liberties, in Washington, D. C., printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to direct the specific attention of the Senate to Senator Cain's comments with regard to the desirability of establishing a commission to study and make recommendations on the Government's security program. After an eloquent plea reaffirming the unique value and indispensability of preserving the letter and the spirit of the Bill of Rights in practice as well as word, Senator Cain made the following dramatic summary:

What I have just recited about the letter of the Bill of Rights means just this: Had you chosen recently between being indicted for a capital or infamous crime or being held to be a loyalty or security risk, there would have been no choice to make. From the indictment, you would have been found guilty or acquitted; sentenced or released through language and methods everyone can understand. From the allegation that you were a loyalty or security risk, you might have long wallowed in the wilderness of despair and mental torment without determining what the charges were all about, or where they came from. Please note my use of the tense. Future consequences from recent refinements in the Federal employees security program remain to be seen.

Our former colleague continues:

Above the pillars of the home in which the Supreme Court resides are these words: "Equal justice under law." There are few exceptions to this rule. We recently have been looking for without finding this sought-after inscription on other public buildings in your Nation's Capital: "Equal justice under government." The absence of this duality is the crux of the dilemma which plagues us. We have grown somehow to consider legal justice to be one thing and administrative justice to be a different sort of thing. Until justice is understood to be indivisible, this Republic of ours will be mired in troubles and beset by problems which defy solutions to be trusted.

These comments are very disturbing, Mr. President. They are not disturbing because they are uttered; they are dis-

turbing rather because they needed to be expressed. It is a privilege for me to commend Senator Cain for his courage in speaking out so clearly, so intelligently and so eloquently. It is likewise a privilege for me to note that Senator Cain looks upon the creation of a commission to study the security program as a partial but a necessary step toward the solution of the problems he raises.

I now read former Senator Cain's comments with regard to the commission:

Does the Government have an adequate answer to the expressed concern by the people that our systems of internal security are growing to be more powerful than the Government? Like you, I wish I knew. It has been suggested that the President appoint, with approval from the Congress, a commission of outstanding citizens to concern itself basically with policy questions relating to internal security. Without sidetracking this proposal with finality, the administration has thought that the Internal Security Section within the Justice Department can reappraise and advocate refinements and policy changes which the future may require.

I think it possible that the Justice Department could do the job but I feel most strongly that a commission would have the better chance of being more effective, persuasive, and helpful to the Nation.

In matters concerning aggression from the outside and the readiness and strength of our military posture at home, the President has available to him advice from the National Security Council. This instrument doesn't represent the views of a single department of the Government. It reflects the consolidated and weighted views of the Government. When this Council speaks, the Nation believes that it is getting a balanced estimate of a given situation.

When it comes to important questions relating to internal security, the President receives his advice from several departments, but these views, as I understand channels of authority, are not necessarily coordinated nor do they always address themselves to the problem as a whole.

When the Attorney General talks about internal security, he almost invariably makes reference to the Federal employment security program. When the President talks with you about the same subject, he may be addressing himself to the Federal employees program or to the security plan in the Armed Forces or the industrial-security program which is administered by the several services within the Defense Department, or to the Atomic Energy Commission's security procedures or to the International Organization Employee Loyalty program.

Certainly the improvements recently adopted for the Federal employees program are not required to be accepted by the other programs.

If an ambition is to achieve uniform and consistent standards and procedures throughout the Federal structure, I can think of no sounder way to approach the problem than through a detached and distinguished nonpartisan commission of some sort.

I think the President would feel better if the recommendations from such a commission were available to him and I know that the Congress and the public would derive a better understanding of what is going on and what should take place in the future.

We do not suffer from any lack of the persons wholly qualified to sit on a commission. Had I the happy assignment of making selections, there would be room for any former President of our Republic. I would look for the experience possessed by retired members of our higher courts. Some exceedingly splendid minds are ready to be used

from within both parties in each House of the Congress. Other national leaders in private life, both men and women, would surely respond to the challenge with energetic alacrity. There would be no problem in staffing a commission to the entire and grateful satisfaction of the Nation.

We often think it a pity that former leaders and builders in one field or another are put out to pasture when they have so much left to offer for the common good. Any among these could be employed for the benefit of everybody.

I am thrilled by the possibility that such a commission may, in due time, be agreed to and established. If our Nation didn't then have every ounce of confidence in the pronouncements to be anticipated, then we shall have lost our capacity for confidence.

Should a commission be authorized, the name of which might be the National Internal Security Council, then our President or those who follow him would be more fully prepared to master the uncertainties of our tomorrows. He or they could listen and consider advice which would accelerate our Nation's strength in all possible fashions.

A simple announcement that a commission is to be established would signify that the marriage between security and politics had been annulled. The cheering to take place all over this land would be heard throughout the world.

He continues:

In utter sincerity, I do maintain that political consideration in security questions has been the major source of our discontent and diminishing confidence in authority since the close of World War II.

There is no reason to say that one political party has been more responsible for this mischief than the other. Under circumstances which prevailed, each party sought to claim the credit for knowing more about security and freedom than the other. National campaigns have revolved around who was going to do what to whom in these fields. There has been no agency within the several administrations and few individuals who have been considered to be disinterested and objectively minded. The charge and countercharge are the weapons employed by partisan minds everywhere. One party is maligned for having attempted too little and the other party is criticized for having attempted too much. Republican and Democratic Party supporters mostly restricted their views to what their articulate spokesmen say. The independent voter picks and chooses from competing headlines.

A commission would have a far better chance of having its judgments considered on their merits. Much of what is good today is disregarded, held suspect, or neglected because it is written off as being politically inspired. The commission could stop most of this. It would, I think, place the greater emphasis on what rather than who is right and best for the Nation in the complicated equations which are the ingredients in the realm of internal security.

It is that spirit, Mr. President, that motivated the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself to introduce Senate Joint Resolution 21 to establish a Commission on Government Security. It is that spirit and those objectives that have been basic to the hearings on our resolution, which ended today, and in which I had the honor of sitting as chairman. These were hearings held by the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Cain has well stated the case for the Commission. We welcome his support as a further indication of the growing bipartisan conviction that a resolution such as ours must be adopted if we

are to protect the integrity of our security system and the integrity of our society as a democratic nation.

The hearings we have just completed, Mr. President, have persuaded me anew as to the desirability and necessity for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 21. Senator Cain's address of this morning will go far toward helping the Congress arrive at this decision in a non-political spirit—not in the spirit of partisanship, but in the spirit of a common desire to strengthen our security program and our democratic institutions.

There is much more to Senator Cain's speech that deserves serious study and consideration by our Government. I am sure that my colleagues know that this is the second of a series of important speeches by former Senator Cain, of Washington, on this very important subject. It is my hope that Members of Congress will read his speech, which I have asked to have printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

I have said that, for all practical purposes, we have concluded the hearings before the subcommittee of which I am privileged to be the acting chairman. It is entirely probable, however, in view of what I consider to be evasiveness, vagueness, and adroitness on the part of 1 or 2 Government witnesses in ducking certain issues, that I may ask for further testimony.

I am sorry to inform the Senate that one of the witnesses, namely, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, did not cooperate with the subcommittee to the extent I felt the subcommittee was entitled to cooperation. The hearings were not held in a spirit of vindictiveness or accusation. They were held in a friendly and warm atmosphere. They were held in a spirit of trying to analyze and bring forth information about the structure and purpose of the internal security program.

Many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee, particularly witnesses from the Department of Defense, from the Atomic Energy Commission, and from the State Department, tried very earnestly to be helpful, and they gave the committee a considerable amount of information, frankly and fully, much of it in prepared testimony, and some of it in cross-examination.

There are still some questions that need to be answered before the subcommittee, particularly with reference to what the review by the Civil Service Commission of preceding security programs offers in terms of suggestions, what deficiencies were found, what inadequacies, if any, were found, and what constructive proposals the Civil Service Commission under its authority can make to the National Security Council.

I regret to say that that information was not given to us. I regret to say also that even elementary statistical evidence which was needed by the subcommittee was not forthcoming. I now, as acting chairman of the subcommittee, serve warning that I shall insist upon that information being given to the responsible Members of the Senate who are charged with the inquiry into the delicate subject of internal security. In the main our hearings have been construc-

tive, and I believe they have been highly informative. It is fair to say that as a result of the hearings we have been able to obtain at least a picture or an image of the so-called structural apparatus of the security program of our Government.

I would be less than candid if I said I was pleased with the picture. In fact, it appears to me that instead of there being one picture, there are many pictures. The situation appears to be more like a mural, with the many separate parts clearly delineated and describing different activities and procedures of the Government.

EXHIBIT A

STRONG IN THEIR PRIDE AND FREE

Mr. Chairman and my fellow citizens, your invitation does me honor and my firm hope in return is to add a little to your knowledge while expressing the fullest measure of my respect and encouragement for your endeavors, past, present, and future.

PART I. THE PAST AS PROLOG

On this day a year ago, the Attorney General of the United States was eloquent, persuasive, and action-advocating when he said to you:

"It is un-American not to be interested in the protection and extension of civil rights."

In further support of this exciting contention, the Attorney General added:

"The need for frank discussion and widespread dissemination of the issues regarding basic freedoms is imperative. The distinguishing feature of our Republic is that it was born of a struggle to secure these rights."

Here we have expressions of our Government's leadership at its finest. This is the character of official talk we citizens praise on hearing. In furtherance of this urging, we can offer details of our thinking in confidence that our petitions will be soberly and painstakingly evaluated and considered. That is all that any responsible citizen can or wants to ask.

If I am pointedly critical of some present-day internal security developments and programs, it should not be inferred that I seek to hinder or embarrass the President, the administration, or the Congress in any fashion. As a member of the administration, my function, with your help, is to strive for action which makes certain that the early-day struggle to secure civil rights will be continued to strengthen and maintain those civil rights. For the office of the President, my respect, like yours, is profound. For the person of the President, my own admiration and affection are keen and sincere. Let no person believe that I have any other ambition than to serve my country through stating what I believe to be true and employable for the common good.

Before getting at the present and reflecting on the future, let us dig into the developments, troubles, and progress of the past.

Unless one has lived along the banks of mighty rivers like the Mississippi or Columbia, it must be exceedingly difficult to appreciate the anxiety of flood fighters who struggle to save lives and property against the coming of the crest of the danger, or the depth of their relief and gratefulness when the peak waters begin to recede. These fighters know then that their work has really just begun but they instinctively comprehend, because of the past, that the battle for survival won't be lost, and that the goal of a less precarious and more reliable future will be achieved.

Most of my life has been spent near these rivers which possess an almost unlimited capacity for good and evil. When harnessed, they open up new and broader opportunities for development and progress. When they take off on a rampage after having overrun

their restraining walls and levees, they cripple and cut back the efforts of builders to move forward. Lessons about our country can be learned by watching a river as it builds or destroys.

The United States is analogous to the mightiest of all rivers, or as an understatement to a combination of the Columbia, Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri, and Colorado, with the strongest of all protective restraining walls and levees. The waters represent the Nation's power to be employed for good or evil; the levees and banks represent the people's potential for discipline, control, moderation, and direction.

The contest of our lives has always been a constant, difficult, and demanding effort to make our national strength serve our peoples' will in ways productive, constructive, just, and lasting. Out of this combat comes greatness and contentment, or futility and ruin. We have benefited and suffered from all of these through the years.

I say without thought of being contradicted that in recent years our Nation's river, driven by the winds and fury of fear, inexperience, suspicion, distortion, and intolerance has overwhelmed and washed away some, but by no means all, of the protective banks which had been constructed out of historical commonsense, reason, and justice.

My reference obviously is to our newly established internal security systems through which an understandable but unwarranted overemphasis on security has treated with far too many Americans as though they were faceless, prideless, and nameless; as though they were spineless, devoid of character, and lacking in that deep sense of devotion to our Republic which stimulates you and me.

But there is good news to be found in the misery. I state with considered conviction that the unruly flood which has threatened to make the essence of civil liberties unrecognizable in America has reached the crest of its most explosive danger and the waters of persecution unintended have slowly started to recede. I do believe that this very real flood menace can now be so managed and disciplined that we shall perhaps and reasonably soon, though not without major mental surgery, hard work, and a more alert citizenry, reconstruct and then maintain an internal security program which will assist in keeping us safe, self-respecting and free.

It has been reassuring to watch the Government and the Congress attempt more in the field of thought, reappraisal and intended procedural changes during the past 2 months than was undertaken in the previous 20 months. I think this is an accurate statement of fact. Certainly it gives promise of a healthier climate to come.

Those among us who are so situated as to acquire some perspective in matters dealing with security and the freedoms have been appalled, but not made cynical or skeptical about the future or entirely surprised, by the lack of balance, poise and understanding which has prevailed lately in high and important places, both public and private.

The peoples' liberties have been generally, in one way or another, temporarily in jeopardy during or after every domestic conflict or external war in which our Nation has been engaged. At intervals between the wars, minorities, many of whom subsequently were noted for their respectability, suffered severely at the hands of majorities and the Government. Need I more than mention some names: Abolitionists, Copperheads, southerners, Mormons, Masons, Catholics, Jews, Irish, Negroes, Germans, union organizers, "scabs," pacifists, teachers, feminists, Japanese, Indians, Chinese. This list could be extended too easily from the memory of any wide-awake and informed citizen.

During the First World War citizens were persecuted and persecuted as obstructionists who advocated change or engaged in political

criticism of those in authority. People could and did go to jail for expressing views held to be contrary to those supported by the Government even when these views were anything but dangerous to the public safety. Many who simply advanced ideas which were unpopular with the majority suffered as though guilty of the most serious crimes.

I wish that every student and thinking adult would give particular attention to the variety of ways and different eras in which Americans have been unfair and ruthless in their treatment of each other. This knowledge would make it easier to understand today's plight and point up the direction to be taken to undo the harm while making repetitions of abuses less likely.

Little has happened to us in this postwar period, shortly to recognize or celebrate its 10th anniversary, that hasn't happened to us before but there are differences we ought to think about.

In every other American period, the problem of disregarding or violating the other person's rights has been of concern only to us here at home. We had no fear or thought of danger from beyond our borders. We had ample time to reunify our people as a solid front to confront any foreign trouble which might be brewing.

Those were the good old days which have gone forever. In those days, we were required to be prepared to fight on foreign soil only part of the time. Now we must remain prepared to fight there or resist and repel aggression here—all of the time.

Our mission as a people and as a government is to so work and stand together in peacetime that we shall want to stand and fight together should there come another wartime.

I think that you here are to be in the vanguard of those who bring about this unity and singleness of our Nation's purpose in either peace or war. If you do not remain as the advance guard in this campaign, then our Nation is headed for disasters of undefinable dimensions. You are the people. The destiny of our Republic is for you to mold. The future will be what we, the people, really want it to become. This is easier said than done but the opportunity remains available.

In another stimulating passage, offered only 52 weeks ago, the Attorney General told you this:

"Our future is secure—for Americans believe above all in the dignity of man. They will never permit the substitution of intolerance and persecution for our cherished heritage: civil liberties."

What does this language really mean? What justifies the language? In what ways should it be applied to our daily lives? Are we using it on only half of an American double standard of justice which appears to be growing? Is the phrase "the dignity of man" essentially an oratorical prop or is it the workable and distinguishing feature between any American and the subjects of lands in which autocracy reigns supreme? Is the American individual actually deserving of any consideration for his dignity if he is thought to be, let us say, a present-day loyalty or security risk?

From this point on, I shall try my level best to offer answers to these related questions which are rational, reasonable, and historically correct.

As a federation of like minds in many organizations, you are joined in labors to preserve those civil liberties without which no human being can long remain free or unoppressed by some government.

If we speak the same language, we agree that what we mean by civil liberties is fundamentally included within the strength and the promise not just of the letter but also the spirit of the first 10 amendments to our Nation's Constitution. Live by those commandments, and no individual can be made a slave by his Government. Repudiate those

commandments, and any government can enslave any people. Don't take my word to be the fact. The bloodshed and turmoil of the ages provide proof which is unassailable.

We Americans aren't what we have become through the years by mere chance. We remain different from most other peoples because the climate for our growth and development has been different from theirs. They have mostly looked to government for their success and health. We have mostly employed government to supplement what we have initiated and accomplished as men and women who have been free to join, to promote, to speak, to change, to believe in God or to be an agnostic or atheist, to move about, to venture, to become wise, to be a fool, to save, and to be ourselves.

It was intended from our beginning as a nation that our Government would guide and direct the national effort to be strong and secure, while every law-abiding citizen would be unmolested and unoppressed by that Government in his house, his person, his mind, his tongue, and his movements.

The dignity of man we are talking about only has a meaning with substance if it incorporates all of these features.

Those who established and were the first public managers of our Republic were singular scholars, historians, and patriots. They had a respect for government, but they knew better than to trust government. They had a respect for people, including themselves, but they knew better than to trust human nature. They were keenly aware that unrestricted government equals tyranny and that unrestricted liberty equals anarchy. They joined hands and hearts in a premeditated effort to establish a society in which there was a balance between a disciplined government and a people who might have liberty without resorting to license. In this attempt, their success exceeded the dreams and aspirations of the centuries which went before.

Those who were to launch America's Ship of State restricted their chances of running aground or off course even before they entered the pilothouse. These were the men who knew that the unratified Constitution before them would become just another future tyrant's scrap of paper unless it was joined by what became the Bill of Rights, your guaranty of a continuing opportunity to walk erect with head high as a free and independent human being.

In hope that they will someday be more widely read and digested, I make reference to a handful of classics which gave direction to our ancestors as they began to carve a different sort of nation from new and unlimited frontiers: The Magna Carta (1215); the Statutes of Westminster (1275); the Petition of Right (1628); Maryland's Toleration Act (1649); the Charter of Rhode Island (1662); Bushell's case (trial by jury, 1670); the Habeas Corpus Act (1679); the Toleration Act (1689); the Zenger case (1734); James Otis' Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved (1764); Samuel Adams' The Declaration of the Rights of Man (1772); the Declaration of Rights and Liberties (1774) issued by the First Continental Congress; Paine's Common Sense (1776); the Early State Bill of Rights of Maryland (1776), New York (1777), and Massachusetts (1780); and Virginia's Statute of Religious Freedom (1785).

All of these expressions were steps forward on the road to protecting the liberties of peoples against their own governments and individuals against the tyranny of majorities.

Then came 1791 and the Bill of Rights, without which there would be no Federal Constitution as we know it.

The Bill of Rights offers no protection to which any individual is not entitled. You can't find within its provisions any snug harbor of safety or comfort for the murderer, robber, rapist, libeler, kidnaper, or

traitor. Taken as a whole, they only demand that those who make charges must prove those charges to be true. Without this restraint, how many men and women might be executed and condemned on denouncements which evaporate when closely examined?

When some in authority refer to fifth amendment Communists, I shudder because of the lack of understanding and power for destructive evil which is inherent in those statements. One who refuses to testify against himself may be a Communist but there are solid and proper reasons why he may not be. There was once a one-eyed man in this country (George Spencer, of New Haven, 1642) who perished on the scaffold because in the agony of his inquisitorial trial by a group of pious and well-intentioned citizens, he pleaded guilty to the charge of having sired a one-eyed monster by a sow belonging to a neighbor. Can you think of better justification for an amendment which requires the accusers to prove their allegations without help from the tongue of the defendant, witness or victim?

Those who use fifth amendment as an adjective of disapprobation modifying the noun "Communist" are as guilty of disrespect for the Constitution as any Communist could be.

Centuries of inquisitorial tortures, mental and physical, and misgivings over man's inhumanity to man forged and tempered the bulwark of freedom that the individual shall not be required to convict himself. We should be less concerned by the few who hide behind the privilege without justification and much more concerned by those who trifle with and prostitute its significance.

Where would our Nation be right now if we couldn't assemble peaceably, or petition the authorities about our grievances, or pray as we like, or speak freely by word of mouth or in the press? For these blessings, we thank the first amendment.

What might our feeling be if we were denied the right to protect ourselves and if the authorities, civilian or military, could requisition our homes in peacetime or ferret through them in looking for things some gossip said might be there? I salute the second, third, and fourth amendments.

If it were not for the sixth amendment, we could rot in jail while waiting for a trial to be conducted by some petty tyrant who might, through whim, eventually inform us of the nature and cause of the accusation. Without this amendment, those who alleged against us would remain undisclosed and we could whistle without response for witnesses to speak out in our favor. Because of the amendment, we get a speedy and public trial; a bill of particulars; legal assistance when required and help in securing witnesses to support our contentions.

Because of the seventh amendment, we are entitled to a trial by jury even where the value in civil controversy is no more than \$20.

If we are thought to be connected with some capital or other infamous crime, the fifth amendment requires our indictment by a grand jury and once acquitted, we shall not again be harassed or tried for the same offense. Once we have reestablished our good reputation, we can keep it.

I was fortunate to have been born an American because only in my beloved country does the law so clearly control the irresponsibility, prejudice, and venom which a considerable number of people, including authorities, possess.

Without the Bill of Rights, no American would be certain of possessing any personality of his own. We would be only what our rulers, masters, or judges wanted to think of us as being. The Bill of Rights was intended to provide every citizen with a name and a face of his own. A nation possessed of citizens without faces or names is a mass of anonymity but it can't be a republic.

In other periods, we have abused the meaning of the Bill of Rights. We are so abusing some of its meaning today. This must not dishearten us because until the amendments have been repealed, and this prospect is not in sight, nor is it likely to be, men and women possessed of reason can prevail upon others to understand that the amendments constitute our American way of life and with courage these same citizens can prevail upon authorities to live in accordance with every one of them.

What I have just recited about the letter of the Bill of Rights means just this: Had you chosen recently between being indicted for a capital or infamous crime or being held to be a loyalty or security risk, there would have been no choice to make. From the indictment, you would have been found guilty or acquitted; sentenced or released through language and methods everyone can understand. From the allegation that you were a loyalty or security risk, you might have long wallowed in the wilderness of despair and mental torment without determining what the charges were all about, or where they came from. Please note my use of the tense. Future consequences from recent refinements in the Federal employees security program remain to be seen.

Please permit me to assume that you do not think I like to make these distinctions. I do so because the fact, which can be too easily documented, is demanding of a broader public circulation.

Above the pillars of the home in which the Supreme Court resides are these words: "Equal justice under law." There are few exceptions to this rule. We recently have been looking for without finding this sought after inscription on other public buildings in your Nation's Capital: "Equal justice under government." The absence of this duality is the crux of the dilemma which plagues us. We have grown somehow to consider legal justice to be one thing and administrative justice to be a different sort of thing. Until justice is understood to be indivisible, this Republic of ours will be mired in troubles and beset by problems which defy solutions to be trusted.

In time, we must agree to reaffirm our faith in a Government by law or renounce that advocacy, which gave us liberty, in favor of supporting a government of men, which has given tyranny to others. The Constitution is no bar to such a change if we Americans want to make it. The question is ours to answer.

As for me, I pray that all of us will come to realize that justice is indivisible, and that every citizen will again believe that he will be as fairly treated under the administrative procedures of his national government, as by the Federal courts of his land. Then, prevailing misunderstandings, distrust, and troubles will disappear as does the fog before the illuminating rays of the sun.

Let us hurry that day.

PART II. SECURITY IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Are you clear in your minds as to where our Nation is headed? I am not. Do you believe that our political leaders know where we are going? I think not. Those who are the most informed can only make calculated guesses. Any estimate of the situation remains largely uncertain because of foreign factors over which the United States has small control.

We probably agree, in whole or in part, that the Communist campaign for the mastery of the world has been joined. We are trying to be stronger than our enemies in hope that they will not attack us and to make it possible for us to defeat them if they do.

In this moment of history which is neither peace nor war, we strive for a better world while preparing to destroy a large part of it if existing differences are not resolved at international council tables.

If the power of the universe is to be employed for peaceful pursuits, heaven on earth is actually in prospect; if this force is to be employed to maim, mangle and dismember, hell on earth shall be realized for civilization must then return to the Dark Ages where there is little light, heat, food, shelter, progress, or satisfactions to be exchanged among the survivors from what we characterize as being the enlightened second or last half of the 20th century.

Winston Churchill said the other day, "imagination stands appalled" by the destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb. He thought, in hoping for the best, it might ironically come about that "safety will be the sturdy child of terror; and survival the twin brother of annihilation."

Like some of you, I am aware that an army division today has 80 percent more fire power than in World War II, and that a single B-17 can wreak as much damage as did the entire Air Force in that many years' war. Atomic cannon and guided missiles have long since left the drafting boards.

As I puzzle and worry over the giganticly contradictory alternatives which face America and mankind, I keep returning to the aspirations which have made us what we are. The best hope I personally have for the future comes from these determinations and progress in our everlasting fight to improve our stature as individuals.

If the world of the present comes tumbling down, as it has the power now for so doing, those who remain alive must begin to build another home for the living from the ruins. The only possible tools to be in our hands in the beginning will be our courage and self-respect, and a hoped for mutual trust among Americans.

In preparing ourselves for either peace or war, we must recognize that these ingredients are indispensable. We can't win any war or long maintain any peace unless we possess all three in abundance.

This personal conviction came to me during World War II when I was privileged to serve with the airborne foot soldiers whom the Germans called those devils in baggy pants.

There was little material difference between us and the well-trained, disciplined, and equipped German soldier. But in the final analysis, there was the difference in spirit which made the big difference in result. The German's government treated him as a number; ours respected us as individuals. Because of this difference, the German couldn't win World War II and we couldn't lose it.

The American's greatest strength was not in his weapons but in what most of them, especially those who died, were convinced was true. At least, the airborne soldier, whom I knew intimately, was powered and motivated by more than the guns and grenades he carried.

They would quietly say before taking off for the unknown anywhere:

"If it be life that waits, then I shall live forever, unconquered.

If it be death, then I shall die at last, strong in my pride and free."

If this motivation is not to be America's salvation and main reliance against the hazards of tomorrow, then I have profaned your time in being your guest and what I wish to suggest in the next few minutes will be valueless.

Unless we remain enthusiastic about being Americans; unless we have confidence in our Government, we aren't likely to see any universal peace established and we aren't going to win any war which may engage us.

If this be so, we ought to reexamine the status of our enthusiasm and the degree of confidence we hold for those in authority.

I have a feeling that the deepest concern shared by millions of citizens today is that

their Government has established a national system of internal security which is becoming more powerful and having a more direct influence on their daily lives than the Government which created it. It becomes increasingly apparent in their minds that the last word has been spoken when some security officer or hearing board puts them to the test. These citizens haven't lost much of their confidence in their leaders but they have lost most of their faith in the octopus-like apparatus which these men and women put together. They feel that this machine has treated them, or it may at some later date, unfairly, unreasonably, and too impersonally. Once caught in the clutches of the machine, it seems to them that sympathetic authorities to whom they turn are powerless to rectify any wrong or to correct any evil.

Citizens generally have few illusions about the age of peril in which all of us live. They understand the domestic need for making our Nation strong and secure. They will not oppose any sound effort to separate the guilty from the innocent in any field which affects their Nation's health. They are prepared to be enthusiastic in any such effort. They want affirmatively to be a part of these endeavors.

The people want their Government to be as confident of their integrity and loyalty as they want to remain convinced that the Government is speaking for and through them and not at or against them.

For the present, millions of citizens do not know what to think. These citizens have become bewildered and troubled by the contradictions between stated purposes and administrative results. They remain aware of the official declarations of intent and purpose regarding the act of August 26, 1950, and Executive Order 10450 which was dated April 27, 1953. This act and order cover 2,400,000 individuals within the Federal establishment. Their intention is to determine that only loyal and trustworthy persons are to be retained or employed. Every employee has been advised that he could expect fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of his Government which would utilize consistent standards of procedure as between Federal departments and agencies.

The vast differences between purpose and result have been properly acknowledged and emphasized by the procedural changes and refinements recently worked out by the Attorney General and approved for adoption by the President. If these improvements are imperatively required, then citizens within and beyond the Federal establishment have been consistent and right in their oft-repeated contentions of alarm.

What these improvements, when taken in the aggregate, amount to seems to be this: Meticulous care will be exercised in determining whether derogatory information justifies suspending an employee; an accused employee is to be advised of what he is charged with in language he can understand; this statement is to be given to him at the time he receives notice of suspension; the charges against the employee will be drafted in consultation with a legal officer who will make certain that the language is meaningful; the accused and the proper agency authority will meet in conference before the employee is suspended; an opinion will be secured from the agency general counsel as to the sufficiency of information justifying suspension; a legal officer will be present at a security board hearing to advise the accused as to his rights; when agencies are in dispute over an employee, they shall first consult with each other before publicly announcing decisions; and, efforts will be made to produce witnesses for the Government so that the accused may confront some among his accusers and cross-examine them.

Many disinterested critics believe these improvements to be an acknowledgment of criticism rather than a desire to reform the system. I do not share this attitude. In

my judgment, the improvements are fundamentally important and they are evidence of officialdom's intentions to consider and press for additional changes.

The knowledge we must keep in mind is that it took the better part of 20 months to solidify these minimum standards of fairness. We ought to perfect machinery which will be self-correcting at a much more rapid pace.

Some of those who have resisted change seem to imply that a system which is just is not capable of being a system which is firm. I denounce this reasoning in an effort to protect those who maintain it. We all want a system to severely punish the disloyal while removing the true security risk from the Federal structure. Can you point to a single one of the recent improvements which softens the firmness of results desired? Firmness and justness are obviously compatible.

These improvements are merely a practical bar to persecution and they make hasty or thoughtless or obviously bad judgments less likely. To me, they represent something more. They begin to remind me of the flavor of the Bill of Rights. They put a nose back on an otherwise faceless person. Because of them, an accused will smell a more refreshing atmosphere. The sculptor's remaining task is to provide these faceless individuals, now possessed of a nose, with ears, eyes, and a mouth.

Does the Government have an adequate answer to the expressed concern by the people that our systems of internal security are growing to be more powerful than the Government? Like you, I wish I knew. It has been suggested that the President appoint, with approval from the Congress, a commission of outstanding citizens to concern itself basically with policy questions relating to internal security. Without side-tracking this proposal with finality, the Administration has thought that the Internal Security Section within the Justice Department can reappraise and advocate refinements and policy changes which the future may require.

I think it possible that the Justice Department could do the job but I feel most strongly that a commission would have the better chance of being more effective, persuasive, and helpful to the Nation.

In matters concerning aggression from the outside and the readiness and strength of our military posture at home, the President has available to him advice from the National Security Council. This instrument does not represent the views of a single Department of the Government. It reflects the consolidated and weighted views of the Government. When this Council speaks, the Nation believes that it is betting a balanced estimate of a given situation.

When it comes to important questions relating to internal security, the President receives his advice from several Departments but these views, as I understand channels of authority, are not necessarily coordinated nor do they always address themselves to the problem as a whole.

When the Attorney General talks about internal security, he almost invariably makes reference to the Federal employees security program. When the President talks with you about the same subject, he may be addressing himself to the Federal employees program or to the security plan in the Armed Forces or the industrial security program which is administered by the several services within the Defense Department, or to the Atomic Energy Commission's security procedures or to the International Organization Employee Loyalty Program.

Certainly the improvements recently adopted for the Federal employees program are not required to be accepted by the other programs.

If an ambition is to achieve uniform and consistent standards and procedures throughout the Federal structure, I can think

of no sounder way to approach the problem than through a detached and distinguished nonpartisan commission of some sort.

I think the President would feel better if the recommendations from such a commission were available to him and I know that the Congress and the public would derive a better understanding of what is going on and what should take place in the future.

We do not suffer from any lack of the persons wholly qualified to sit on a commission. Had I the happy assignment of making selections, there would be room for any former President of our Republic. I would look for the experience possessed by retired members of our higher courts. Some exceedingly splendid minds are ready to be used from within both parties in each House of the Congress. Other national leaders in private life, both men and women, would surely respond to the challenge with energetic alacrity. There would be no problem in staffing a commission to the entire and grateful satisfaction of the Nation.

We often think it a pity that former leaders and builders in one field or another are put out to pasture when they have so much left to offer for the common good. Any among these could be employed for the benefit of everybody.

I am thrilled by the possibility that such a commission may, in due time, be agreed to and established. If our Nation didn't then have every ounce of confidence in the pronouncements to be anticipated, then we shall have lost our capacity for confidence.

Should a commission be authorized, the name of which might be the National Internal Security Council, then our President or those who follow him would be more fully prepared to master the uncertainties of our tomorrows. He or they could listen and consider advice which would accelerate our Nation's strength in all possible fashions.

A simple announcement that a commission is to be established would signify that the marriage between security and politics had been annulled. The cheering to take place all over this land would be heard throughout the world.

In utter sincerity, I do maintain that political considerations in security questions has been the major source of our discontent and diminishing confidence in authority since the close of World War II.

There is no reason to say that one political party has been more responsible for this mischief than the other. Under circumstances which prevailed, each party sought to claim the credit for knowing more about security and freedom than the other. National campaigns have revolved around who was going to do what to whom in these fields. There has been no agency within the several administrations and few individuals who have been considered to be disinterested and objectively minded. The charge and countercharge are the weapons employed by partisan minds everywhere. One party is maligned for having attempted too little and the other party is criticized for having attempted too much. Republican and Democratic Party supporters mostly restrict their views to what their articulate spokesmen say. The independent voter picks and chooses from competing headlines.

A commission would have a far better chance of having its judgments considered on their merits. Much of what is good today is disregarded, held suspect, or neglected because it is written off as being politically inspired. The commission could stop most of this. It would, I think, place the greater emphasis on what rather than who is right and best for the Nation in the complicated equations which are the ingredients in the realm of internal security.

It is not for me to say that we shall or shall not construct a commission. Regardless of who future managers are to be, there remains much to be undertaken and more

to be thought about by every citizen or public servant who has any regard for liberty or responsibility for any phase of internal security.

On my own responsibility, I soberly but gladly offer some suggestions and raise several questions which may be of broad concern for they are by no means restricted to the Federal employees security program under Executive Order 10450. We are not so fortunate presently as to be operating under a single security system.

Every suggestion to be made is predicated on the assumption, in which I believe, that what we Americans and our leaders actually want most is a maximum of firmness and a maximum of justness in any internal security system or systems to bear a stamp of legitimacy and approval in the United States.

First. Are we likely to develop a sufficient number of qualified security officers, hearing board members, and administrators to supervise, coordinate, operate, and understand prevailing security programs without establishing training schools of the highest order? The answer seems to be self-evident.

No individual is permitted to practice law or medicine or teach or be an FBI agent or become an officer in any branch of the armed services without extensive training which is thorough, intensive, and specialized. Is there less need for training in the person who deals with the preciousness of another's reputation?

Those within the Government who most strongly defend the policies behind our security systems often admit that a lack of experience has caused admitted abuses. What is being done to provide the right kind of experience?

If the age of peril goes on for half a century, our security systems will be continued for the same or longer length of time. It is provocative to think that some of our grandchildren may express the wish to be security officers rather than cowboys or professors or sailors when they grow up.

People ask how many citizens are now investigated, examined, or heard through security systems. I suppose that an accurate answer does not exist. If you add the 2½ million Federal employees to the several million now requiring clearances in industry, plus our citizens employed by the United Nations, the thousands of officers in the armed services, the considerable totals covered by the AEC, and perhaps higher maritime figures, you can reasonably conclude that as many as 20 million Americans are affected directly or indirectly today. When the breadwinner gets covered or in trouble, his family is concerned or in trouble, too.

We have built our systems faster than we could control them effectively or fairly. It is past time that we caught up. Were international tensions to increase by a few percentage points, or if we go to war, and our security programs expand accordingly, we would possess neither the personnel nor experience to master the difficulties.

The result would be security without direction or purpose, or a purpose without security. While nobody is shooting at us, we ought to prepare for any storm.

Second. Item 2 of the recently adopted 7 improvements said "meticulous care should be exercised in the matter of suspension of employees against whom derogatory information has been received."

I have long wondered why any alleged security risk, particularly those holding non-sensitive positions, should be suspended prior to the hearing to which an individual is entitled. What purpose really is served by these suspensions? On the basis of the record which points out that many of the persons accused are cleared and restored to duty after their hearing, it taxes credulity to agree that our security has been strengthened by the suspensions. It is easier to agree that human beings have been needlessly hurt.

If there is reason to suspend an employee as an alleged security risk, there must be ample grounds for holding a hearing. Why the suspension and then delay before the hearing? Why? Is this practice to be called firmness? Is this treatment to be thought of as being just?

A hearing is held to determine whether the retention in employment in the Federal service of a particular individual is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security. Why not notify the employee that the question is pending through a statement to him which relates the when, where, whom, and what to the charges against him; then give this employee a reasonable period for preparing his defense; then hold the hearing which will recommend his dismissal or retention without any further prejudice.

Would the Government be harmed if this practice became the custom? How could it be harmed?

What about the employee who has been suspended with several months to wait before his hearing? He watches his limited resources rapidly evaporate. The statement of charges he carries in his pocket has too often been too vague for some outside attorney to understand; his family begins to wonder where their next meal is coming from; his neighbors think it strange that he spends so much time around the house; his children are pleased at first but they begin to wonder soon; if he is innocent of any wrongdoing, and this is more often the case than not, he just wonders and suffers, and generally prays.

How many times does this employee resign after having been suspended because he thinks he doesn't have a chance and there is no point in requesting a hearing? There is every logical reason not to agree with those who blithely point to a resignation after suspension as being an admission of guilt. A man must earn and live. If he can't afford the waiting and the money to defend himself at a future hearing, he must get to work at something because his family must eat and his children must go on going to school.

On November 22, 1954, a clerk, a GS-4, I think, was suspended by a great agency of the Government for it was alleged that she had been a member of the Washington Book Shop in either 1940 or 1941. This she denied under oath. Her hearing was held on March 2, 1955. No decision had been reached on last Monday when I committed this reference to paper. Is any such suspension justified? How could her retention, pending a hearing, impose either trouble or injury on the agency? What has the action of that agency done to her enthusiasm and confidence in her Government?

The more I consider the practice of suspension before hearings, the more I believe that it weakens but does not strengthen internal security.

Third. Under the seven new improvements, it is provided that a legal officer be present at security board hearings to advise the employee, if not represented by counsel, as to his rights under Executive Order 10450, as amended, and the pertinent regulations.

Here we encounter the question, "Is not the employee entitled to something more than a mere recitation of his rights?" Why should he not be assisted by the Government in his defense? That Government does not wish to persecute him; it endeavors rather to determine if the employee is, in fact, a security risk.

The court-martial has long been employed by the armed services as an instrument of security and fairness. This court provides competent counsel for any draftee or professional serviceman who is brought before it. Is the civil servant less entitled to protection than the individual who volunteers or is required to wear the uniform of his country? Are we content to say that one is a judicial and the other an administrative

proceeding? Is it not apparent that careers and reputations are equally at stake?

The accused before a military court-martial is actually less in need of legal assistance, which he gets automatically, than is the accused before a security-board hearing, who either contracts for his legal aid on the outside or goes without.

Testimony before a court-martial is restricted; that admitted by a security-board hearing may be anything, everything, or practically nothing. The one who stands accused before this administrative body needs, and I think he is deserving of, legal assistance from the agency which submits the charges.

Private bar associations are offering legal assistance free of charge to Federal employees involved in security-risk cases. As a taxpayer, I resent the implication that a public servant must be protected from his Government by outside help.

If our policy becomes that of providing legal assistance to those accused, would we be less than firm in our Nation's desire to rid the Government of undesirables? You know we would not.

The absence of legal assistance is perplexing enough for the civil servant but even more demanding of consideration in the field of industrial security. Its only three hearing boards are situated in San Francisco, Chicago, and New York. The persons here concerned for the most part are scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians. They must travel to and from the hearings at their own expense. All of the many other costs, including attorney fees, come out of their own pockets. Why shouldn't too many of those accused just quit after suspension and seek employment in some nondefense industry? Many of them do and their departure hurts them less than it does the Government which needs every superior mind and skill it can prevail upon to contribute to the defense effort.

This question of legal aid in its entirety has no ready answer. Is it not deserving of public study and exploration?

Fourth. The sixth improvement, recently announced, says that even though the statute does not provide subpoena power, every effort should be made to provide witnesses for the Government to be confronted and cross-examined by the accused, so long as their presence would not jeopardize the national security.

This seems to be more of an expression of hope than reality. How many witnesses who provide unsworn derogatory information will respond to an invitation to appear, to be sworn, to submit to cross-examination, and to pay whatever travel and living costs are involved? My guess is that very few will show up.

If we have a pressing need for security boards, as we do, should they not be equipped with every facility for reaching decisions which are firm and just? Without the subpoena power, these boards must do a lot of guessing, which can impose real and avoidable harm and trouble on either the Government or the employee. At least, it appears so to me.

The Government employs undercover agents, paid informers, and casual informers, for whom it wishes to guarantee anonymity. This is a touchy question, but I think it not indiscreet to refer to my understanding of the casual informer. Most of us have been casual informers from time to time. Investigators ask us what we know or desire to say about our friends, coworkers, associates, and acquaintances. Should we not be willing to say under oath and at a hearing what we have freely said, be that derogatory or praiseworthy, within the four walls of our home or office? If we are unwilling, should we not be required to support our judgment or retract it?

The accused employee is constantly impressed by the sad consequences to result

if he does not tell the truth. I think it sadder that he can be torn to shreds by the tongue of a person he never sees. Perjury ought to be as applicable to the accuser as to the accused.

The Government has stated in the improvements that the rights of the Government and of the employees are fully safeguarded when persons possessing the highest degree of integrity, ability, and good judgment sit as members of security boards. Such qualities when unrelated to established knowledge are often wasted and work in the dark.

Five. Contradictions between security systems could be reconciled with a resulting clearer understanding and increased confidence in the public's mind. How a division within the Justice Department can bring this unity about, assuming it to be desirable, I do not know. Certainly assistance from the Congress would be necessary.

Under Executive Order 10450, the applicant with derogatory information against him may or may not be told that such exists or the nature of it. The person for whom he seeks to work can discuss the question with him but is not required to do so. If the applicant surmises that there is a security question about his employment, there is no official avenue through which he can be fully or factually informed. Generally he hears nothing from official sources and he seldom receives the sought-after appointment.

Under the Atomic Energy Commission's procedures, the same applicant would be advised of the derogatory charges, encouraged to answer, and automatically granted a hearing if he desired one.

Under the industrial-security plan, this applicant would automatically be denied employment for any assignment requiring a clearance. Industry has no preemployment examination to clear away derogatory information.

AEC hearing board members are largely distinguished private citizens. Those under Executive Order 10450 are all employees within the Federal establishment, while those who serve on industrial security boards are officers from the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or civilians who are generally retired officers from the armed services.

Under Executive Order 10450 and the industrial-security system, the standard by which employees are retained is whether their retention is clearly consistent with the national security.

Under the Atomic Energy Commission, personnel is retained if their retention will not endanger the common defense and security.

These standards and procedures are poles apart. Some among them are infinitely preferable to others. The present is the best time to make the choice.

Those who believe as I do would never advocate a system which denies an opportunity to any applicant to explain away or clear up the derogatory information which has been filed against him. Unless it is cleared away, this individual, who may be totally above legitimate criticism, is not likely to have a reasonable chance for Federal employment in any other agency. Once you have any kind of written record with the Government, it becomes your shadow and follows you everywhere. If there is a cloud on that record, you may be well thought of elsewhere but hardly by the Government.

The pride I want to have in my Government does not permit me to view with favor any machinery which seemingly favors a standard of mediocrity over a standard of excellence. Unless registered derogatory information is examined in consultation with its subject, our Government will be more and more inclined to accept for employment only those against whom nothing bad or little good is said. Many of these applicants will become first-rate personnel but a large

number will be unimaginative drones of the first order. We ought more readily to appreciate human nature. The most intelligent and progressive people we can think of are supported by many friends and opposed, sub rosa and less often publicly, by many enemies. Greed, jealousy and selfishness often are reflected in the derogatory information registered against an applicant.

It will take time, thought, desire and money to be more thorough and careful in evaluating an applicant's Form 57. In doing so, however, the strength of our Government would be increased. In clearing away derogatory information about a particular individual, it might well result that he or she was possessed of the qualities and driving force of genius. Has our Government, speaking for the people, ever been more in need of these characteristics?

Sixth. In 1947, the Attorney General was directed by the President to compile a list of organizations thought to be totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive. Memberships in organizations on this list were to be considered by the Civil Service Commission in judging the loyalty of applicants and public servants in the Federal service.

The organizations on the Attorney General's current subversive list totals more than 250. Some 75 of these organizations have been listed since 1952.

Every applicant for the Federal service and every employee within that service has been required to state whether he is currently or has ever been a member of any organization listed by the Attorney General.

Is it not proper to explore the desirability of eliminating that portion of the question which relates to memberships which were resigned or renounced or which lapsed prior to the listing which was first made public in 1947?

If an individual's conduct, attainments, and attitudes have been above reproach during the past 8 years, or since 1947, is it not a legitimate calculated risk to assume that he had been a loyal citizen during the years which went before? I think the risk can be intelligently taken.

By what training are we qualified to examine the years and conditions before 1947? No more than a mere handful of persons have any knowledge about the history, character, make up and purposes of most of the listed organizations. Who among your acquaintances has any knowledge about them? The fact is that a large majority of those who evaluate applications and investigate civil servants are without sufficient knowledge to reach a rational judgment covering the past. They interpret the list, which is all they have before them, in any way they please.

Is it not logical to understand that one may have joined the Workers Alliance because unemployed, or taken out a card at the Washington Book Shop during the early 1940's in order to buy books or records at a discount, or joined one of the friendship-with-Russia groups during the World War II alliance, without in any of these cases ever knowing that the organization was subversive or controlled by the Communists?

Has our society become so lacking in vitality, vision and strength that we must pour over the ashes of a dead period in the past which will not be fully analyzed by historians for another 50 years? When this Nation of ours fought its way West to open up new frontiers, a contributor was judged for what he could do and for what he was rather than against any standard to evaluate what he had been in the years of his youth and growth. I am not suggesting that we give consideration only to memberships which were taken out in this year. I am bluntly suggesting that an examination of a person's record over an 8-year period from 1947 to 1955 is sufficient to judge the usefulness and loyalty of that person at this moment and for the future.

This question, concerning the past, when raised becomes demanding of discussion and thought.

When the Nation substituted a broader security program for a restricted loyalty program, the Attorney General's list was supplied to the heads of all departments and agencies for use by their security apparatus. This list is presently being employed for many purposes beyond the security program—for passport denials; by local officials and private owners to deny meeting halls; and for teachers' oaths to state but several.

The Attorney General's list, when related to memberships prior to 1947, excepting previous membership in the Communist Party, USA, is causing an extravagant and futile waste of time and energy which ought to be utilized in seeking solutions for problems of the present.

All I do professionally is to work on those portions of the list which cover alleged Communist organizations. My experience has taught me, or I have grown to believe, that memberships in these groups are often absolutely meaningless unless they are related to when, where and why.

The Attorney General is presently seeking to list the National Lawyers Guild as the legal mouthpiece for communism in our country, but had I been an enterprising law-school undergraduate or Negro lawyer in the late 1930's, I would probably have joined it. The American Bar Association of that period did not permit Negroes to membership nor did it provide any limited membership for the undergraduate who sought a close association with his legal elders. Had I joined and then resigned before 1945, should I now be held suspect and penalized for having been ambitious in my youth?

A person may have been a dupe in joining a listed organization which is thought now to have been subversive but it does not follow that he necessarily was disloyal. With respect to those who resigned from these organizations before they were listed by the Attorney General, I think we can easily afford to assume that the resignation was initiated for cause by a good American.

Among my own friends are those who renounced their memberships in given organizations some years before they were listed. These individuals were more farsighted than their Government, but instead of being praised, they have been too often denied Federal employment. Is this reaction by authorities the exercise of commonsense?

Do you remember when people were fired from the Government for expressing antagonistic views about our wartime alliance and friendship with our Communist ally, Soviet Russia? Do we forget that Communists were commissioned in our armed services not long ago? Can you not recollect the public encouragement given to some of the listed organizations by the most prominent public and private personalities during World War II? How many of the members of that period joined because their leaders spoke out in open praise for the organizations? A very large number were so stimulated, encouraged, or coerced.

That period of our past from 1930 through 1945 was a confused, groping, bewildering series of contradictions. We fought and suffered through a depression and engaged in a global war. We kept company with some strange and disagreeable allies and fair-weather friends. We did all of this in an agonizing and amazing effort to conquer the unknown and to keep our liberties. In having done both, is it not practical, humane, and desirable to forget the past before 1947 so that we may do a better job of going forward from there and from now?

One trouble with going backward is that of never knowing where to stop. What organization will be listed tomorrow in which past memberships will embarrass and cloud the reputations of those now employed who

are considered above reproach by their superiors and friends.

Seventh. There is more to ponder over in the Attorney General's list than memberships before 1947. The question which intrigues me is what ought to be done with the Attorney General's list?

I am not the first to be so intrigued. The Congress spent years in working for an answer.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 established the Subversive Activities Control Board. The function of this body is to adjudicate the merits of cases through which the Attorney General alleges that organizations exist in this country which are dominated, directed, infiltrated, and controlled by international communism or by the Communist Party, U. S. A.

In these proceedings, the Board moves with cautious thoroughness because the sanctions to be applied to Communist-action or Communist-front organizations are severe and onerous. The Attorney General is required to establish his allegations to be true, as would any prosecutor before any court, and the respondent is provided with every opportunity to prove that the allegations are unfounded in fact, as he would be encouraged to do before any bar of justice.

If this process of adjudication is desirable, should we not speed up the process and thus move in the direction of liquidating the Attorney General's list? Without this process, the Attorney General's list, as it refers to Communist organizations, would remain outstanding in perpetuity without being adjudicated. Any fair-minded American would be made to feel uncomfortable by any prospect of this kind.

Many of the organizations on the Attorney General's list are said to have been inspired and organized by Fascist, totalitarian, or subversive movements unrelated to communism. How are the facts about these organizations to be established? Many of the organizations have been dead for years and in this sense, they are defenseless. Should we go on casting discredit on individuals who belonged to this type of organization many years ago?

The Internal Security Act of 1950 might be amended to provide the same method for adjudicating totalitarian, Fascist, and subversive organizations as is now provided for Communist organizations. Otherwise these non-Communist but subversive organizations will continue to be listed, without much meaning, forever and a day.

Some of the listed organizations had but a single purpose and brief existence. Shall all of those who belonged to these groups be held suspect for as long as they live? Would it not serve the public interest to eliminate all of the deadwood from the Attorney General's list as soon as possible?

I can give you a dozen reasons why we ought to hurry with this pressing task of liquidating the Attorney General's list. The most illuminating reason is to be found in a question which the Department of Defense in its industrial security program requires to be answered by any person who seeks a clearance to handle classified information. This question reads: "Are you now associating with or have you within the past 5 years associated with any individual, including relatives, who you know or have reason to believe are or have been members of any of the organizations designated by the Attorney General as having interests in conflict with those of the United States?"

If your answer to this question is "Yes," even though you make reference to a cousin five times removed or to a casual friend with whom you share an occasional glass of beer, your answer in itself constitutes derogatory information against you. If the answer is "Yes" and you are an applicant rather than an employee, you have closed the door to employment in your own face. If the an-

swer is "No," but others think it should be "Yes," you may find it exceedingly difficult to clear away the seeming discrepancy. If the answer is "Yes," but others believe it should be "No," then you have placed them in a dilemma which may ensnare you before it has been resolved.

We are not accustomed to any citizens' informer system in this country. Yet, throughout defense plants in American industry, we have established one. In the above question we are asking citizens to probe the past from which their coworkers, relatives, and friends have come. Who among us is knowing enough to relate the past to circumstances which prevailed? This is a task to be assumed only by the most knowing professionals.

Though I personally believe this procedure is not in our Nation's best interest, I am constrained to inquire as to why the question to which I have referred is not included as a question in the Federal employment form 57? If there is need for an all-inclusive informer system within industry, there ought to be a like need for such a system within the Government. Perhaps, on reflection, those who take action in these matters will consider any citizens' informer system within industry or the Government to be as distasteful and harmful in the long run as I do.

The Attorney General's list ought, in my judgment, to be liquidated through procedures which our country supports. The merits of the charges against any listed organization should be adjudicated. Sanctions should apply to those who remain as members after an organization has been found to be guilty as alleged by the Attorney General. We ought to permit and encourage those who resign or have previously quit, to work and travel without restraint or prejudice. In what other way can the list be liquidated? In what other fashion can fairness be maintained? In what other way can we distinguish between those who are dedicated to an un-American cause, and those who seek a way out as soon as they are given established reason to believe that they have been hoodwinked. Many among us have been silly, foolish, and stupid in the years of our past but how many among us have or want to be disloyal? That list is remarkably short. This knowledge ought to make us cheerful and keep us so.

There remains an important question to be raised concerning any Attorney General's authority to list organizations as being subversive or un-American. What should the time lag be between his listing an organization and when he prosecutes his charges before a body of competent jurisdiction? Until the prosecution of a case is undertaken, the listing authority remains as judge, jury, and prosecutor. This is hardly in keeping with our historic tradition of charge, prosecution, and verdict. In my opinion, no organization should be listed unless it is simultaneously announced that prosecution will be initiated in the case within a period of several months. Is this attitude unreasonable? Would its adoption endanger our desire to be firm with those who are found to be our enemies? I raise the question because we are no closer to adjudicating some of the listed organizations than we were on a day in 1947 when the organizations were publicly listed. We need a better answer to this question than has been available during 8 long years. We continue to list organizations much more rapidly than they are being disposed of.

Your patience this morning has been quite remarkable but the depth of my appreciation for your interest and invitation is comparable. In departing from your presence, I take away to be treasured always a stimulating, encouraging, heart-warming memory.

I leave you with this wrap-up conviction and expressed hope.

The complete measure of a government, like that of an individual, can only be judged

by the fashion in which it assumes and fulfills its unenforceable obligations.

These are the areas of public concern we have emphasized today. We expect and pray that our government will be just in its treatment of every citizen not because the laws of our land so require in every instance, for they do not, but because that government wants and will remain determined to be just.

In this Republic, the Government represents, acts, and speaks for us, its people. It continues for us, the people, to petition that government while joining minds, hearts, and hands with it in ways destined to sharpen the unlimited powers of liberty; to keep the Nation progressive, alert, and resourceful; to provide a climate in which the individual is self-reliant, self-respecting, and free.

May health and happiness bless you all.
I wish you well.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Joseph Campbell.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Campbell, a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The Senate should disapprove the nomination of Joseph Campbell for appointment as Comptroller General of the United States.

I have arrived at this conclusion after careful study of the history of the Office and its functions as an agency of the legislative branch of the Government, with which Mr. Campbell has had no previous knowledge or experience.

While Mr. Campbell undoubtedly is qualified in the accounting field, one of the functions performed by the Comptroller General, he is completely lacking in legal, judicial, or

legislative experience and training, which, in our view, are essential requirements for the performance of the quasi-judicial functions of the Office and in carrying out other important responsibilities of the Comptroller General.

Although it is not required that an appointee to the position of Comptroller General must necessarily be a lawyer, I do believe that any nominee who has had no legal, judicial, or legislative training lacks the essential qualifications to carry out the duties and responsibilities vested in the Office by the basic statutes under which the General Accounting Office was established and which govern its operations.

The Office of the Comptroller General was created to provide the Congress with a fiscal and legal agent, vested with quasi-judicial authority, whose duty it would be to audit the accounts of all Federal agencies; to review the manner in which executive branch departments and agencies are executing and administering programs authorized by Congress; and to analyze the expenditure of appropriated funds to insure compliance with the intent of the Congress under legislation which authorized the programs. Thus, his responsibility to the legislative branch includes reporting deficiencies in administration, waste, and extravagance in the expenditure of appropriated funds, and providing the Congress with essential information relative to operations of the Federal Government upon which legislative action must be based.

The Comptroller General is required by law to prepare and issue numerous decisions covering practically the entire range of Government operations, many of which are extremely complex and highly controversial. He must also resolve questions arising out of the normal operations of the General Accounting Office; render decisions on the legality of Federal expenditures, with particular reference to whether programs under which funds are to be expended have been authorized by law and that the manner of their expenditure conforms to the intent of the Congress; review the legality of Federal contracts and expenditures made pursuant thereto, as well as the settlement of accounts and claims against the Federal Government. His decisions are binding on the executive branch and are often considered and cited by the Federal courts.

In order to perform these duties properly, the Comptroller General must have had experience with and a detailed knowledge of the legislative process, or sufficient legal training to enable him to evaluate the intent of the statutes approved by the Congress and to report fully on deviations from the intent of Congress.

The legislative history of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which created the General Accounting Office and the Office of the Comptroller General, clearly demonstrates the emphasis placed by the Congress on the importance of making the Office entirely independent of executive control, with sole responsibility to the legislative branch. Serious consideration was given to placing the appointment of the Comptroller General under the control of the Congress itself, in order to insure that the appointee would be responsible only to the legislative branch. It was determined, however, that such a provision of law would be an infringement on the appointive powers of the President, and, after extensive debate, the power to make the nomination was vested in the President, with the added legislative control that he could be removed by the Congress by the passage of a joint resolution (which would require Presidential approval).

The debates in Congress clearly illustrate the fact that this appointive power was reluctantly vested in the President as a matter of necessity so as to meet other requirements of law. To emphasize its desire to insure the separation of legislative and executive powers under the Budget and Accounting

Act of 1921, the Congress also provided in the act for the establishment of the Bureau of the Budget, headed by an officer—the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—who would serve the executive in a capacity similar to that in which the Comptroller General was to serve the Congress. The act did not require Senate confirmation of this officer on the premise that he should be responsible only to the President, and could be appointed or removed at the will of the President without congressional interference or Senate approval, as is required of all other officials of the Government appointed to positions of similar importance.

Under present policy, unless there is some question raised as to the qualifications of the appointee or his fitness for the office, nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for appointive positions in the executive branch are confirmed under a more or less routine procedure, based on the premise that the President has the right to select officials who will be responsible to his direction and qualified to carry out his policies without congressional interference. An appointee to the Office of the Comptroller General, however, being accepted generally as one responsive only to the legislative branch, should have required, in the view of the minority, not only the consent but the advice of the Senate. No information was submitted at the hearings to indicate that the President consulted with or sought the advice of Members of Congress before submitting the nomination of Mr. Campbell to the Senate. Thus, there arises the question of whether Mr. Campbell, should he be confirmed by the Senate as a Presidential appointee, would be responsive to the wishes of the President or the Congress, in the event of a serious controversy between the executive and legislative branches which he might be called upon to resolve.

During the quarter century that the General Accounting Office has been in existence, and the Comptroller has acted to assist the Congress in retaining its control over the expenditure of public funds, a number of efforts have been made to weaken the powers vested in that office, and to transfer certain of its functions to the executive branch. The Congress has strenuously and successfully resisted these moves.

It is my view that the Senate should reject the confirmation of Mr. Campbell, in order that the Congress may make certain that the General Accounting Office will continue to perform functions essential to the retention of congressional supervision over Federal expenditures, and to insure that the legislative branch may retain its status as a coequal branch of the Government.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 51, Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing further expenditures and temporary employment of additional assistants by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 57) which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "authorized", to strike out "until" and insert "through", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making studies as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and pursuant to its jurisdiction under rule XXV (1) (d) 4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized through January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and with the consent of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the resolution provides for more clerical help for the Banking and Currency Committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, I will say that the committee report which was submitted in connection with the resolution carries a suggested budget. The committee has been carrying on an investigation since last April, I believe, or about that time, and we did not propose to use more help; in fact, I do not think we will use even as much help as we used during the investigation last year; but additional help is needed. The budget is set forth in the report of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution provides for what?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It provides for a continuing investigation and a study of the whole housing program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there are quite a few resolutions on the calendar calling for the expenditure of more and more money. I thought that before we proceeded to the individual consideration of these resolutions I would make a preliminary statement as to the resolutions, and then, as each resolution comes before the Senate, it is my hope to obtain a little more detail in trying to ascertain the necessity for it.

I dislike to make myself, may I say, more or less obnoxious to many of the Members of the Senate and the investigative staffs when I take the floor to ascertain the purposes of the many resolutions which are submitted at the beginning of each Congress.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, many, if not all, of these resolutions authorizing funds for so-called temporary investigations are submitted with the statement of the proponents that "We hope to get through

this session without further expenditures." But that is seldom the case, Mr. President. As I have frequently pointed out, unlike the old soldier who never dies but merely fades away, these special committees not only never die, but they seem to grow larger and stronger as time goes on. They become more powerful and healthier. There are, as I have previously pointed out, professional staffmen on Capitol Hill—professional investigators, if you will—who make it their business to either expand their investigations, or to create more and more of these special committees so as to preserve and perpetuate their jobs and their lucrative salaries. The record I have before me testifies adequately as to their success, Mr. President.

In 1940, the amount of money which was appropriated for special investigation committees was \$170,268.04. From year to year, the amounts increased. In 1945 the amount had increased from \$170,268.04 to \$427,574.

During the fiscal year 1947, the first year after the passage of the Reorganization Act in 1946, special investigation costs increased to \$692,603.65.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Was it not at that time that the special committees were forbidden, by a rule of the Senate, to borrow personnel from executive departments? I well remember that at that time a special committee could be set up with only \$3,000 or \$4,000, and by borrowing the necessary personnel from the executive departments. But by a resolution adopted by the Senate, the borrowing of personnel from the executive departments of the Government was forbidden, and it became necessary for the committees to employ their own personnel. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. But the amount of the appropriations from 1946 onward, even after the adoption of the resolution to which the Senator has referred, has continued to increase, until today, as I shall point out in a few minutes, one committee of the Senate, the Judiciary Committee—headed by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia—will receive more than a million dollars in order to carry on its operations for this year alone.

I say it is time to call a halt to all these expenditures. I say it is time to cut down on staffs and eliminate the so-called temporary investigations which cost so much money.

Let me refresh the memory of the Senate as to the manner in which these temporary probes have multiplied and expanded.

In 1950, which was several years after the adoption of the resolution to which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has referred, the amount spent by the Senate on special investigations increased to \$1,277,094.39.

In 1952, the amount was \$1,727,000. In 1953, it was \$1,739,329.

Last year \$1,936,217.29 was expended. This shows a gradual but substantial increase from year to year. What is the

outlook for 1955? I should like briefly to review the current status of these appropriations. The Senate, at this session of Congress, already has approved resolutions for the following special studies:

For the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to study certain interstate commerce problems, \$200,000; for the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to study the internal security program, \$125,000; for the Committee on Banking and Currency, to study the economic stabilization and mobilization problems, \$100,000; for the Committee on Armed Services, a carryover from its investigation of the preparedness program, \$63,647; for the Committee on Foreign Relations, to investigate the technical assistance program, \$52,000; for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to investigate critical materials, \$70,000; for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, general investigations, \$60,000; for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to study pension funds, \$190,000; for the Committee on Government Operations, for the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, \$190,000.

This makes a total, already approved and acted upon, of \$1,050,647 for the year 1955.

If the Senate today should adopt the resolutions which are now on the calendar, there will have been added to the \$1,050,647, the further sum of \$1,104,600, thereby making a grand total, for 1955, of \$2,155,247.

That will be an increase of more than \$200,000 over last year; and the year 1955 is still young; this is only March. I suspect that from this time forward, other committees will be coming before the Senate, asking for more money.

As I have just indicated the Senate has for consideration today 12 resolutions seeking amounts aggregating \$1,104,647.

In that total are included the following appropriations: Internal Security Subcommittee, \$260,000; Antitrust Subcommittee, a brand new investigatory body, \$250,000—and this amount is being asked in the face of the fact that the Attorney General has been making surveys and studies of the antitrust laws for the past 2 years. Congress already has a wealth of information, previously gathered; yet the Senate today is being asked to provide another \$250,000 in order to study the problem further. I say this is pure duplication of effort. It is not necessary, and it should not be done.

If the Attorney General has recommendations to make, they should be submitted, and I am sure in due course they will be submitted, to the Committee on the Judiciary; and I am also sure that the Judiciary Committee will undoubtedly recommend remedial legislation to the Senate. Such proposed legislation must necessarily be considered by the regular committee.

The \$250,000 which the Senate is now being asked to appropriate is money which will simply be thrown down the drain.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator from Louisiana is incorrect about the consideration of the reports made by the Attorney General. The subcommittee in question is a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. As such, it would be the one to hold hearings to consider the reports of the Attorney General.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt that if the Senate follows the regular procedure, the recommendations of the Attorney General will be submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that committee will undoubtedly suggest amendments to the law. As a rule, it is the full committee which considers the reports, not special committees.

The Senator knows as well as I do that what the special committees do is to hold hearings. After they have concluded the hearings, the subcommittees submit their findings and recommendations to the full committees. It often happens that the full committee will then look into the matter and decide whether the recommendations should be enacted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The chairman of Committee on the Judiciary is present and can speak for himself, but I submit that in that committee—and I suppose the same practice is followed in most other committees—matters affecting the antitrust laws, and similar laws, are submitted to a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings and investigations, following which the subcommittee makes its report to the full committee.

The Committee on the Judiciary as a whole has so much business before it that it would not be possible to have it considered by the committee as a whole; therefore, it is necessary to refer it to subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Unquestionably the Attorney General spent thousands of dollars in order to gather the information upon which he expects to base his recommendations to the Committee on the Judiciary; and no doubt he will recommend that some laws be enacted.

The Senator from Tennessee knows what the procedure is, and I shall demonstrate it in a minute with respect to the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, of which the Senator, as I understand, will be the chairman. That subcommittee has been in existence during the years 1953 and 1954.

The committee has traveled in many parts of the country. It has submitted a report indicating what the trouble is, and suggesting legislation. What is going to happen with respect to those recommendations? As I understand, proposed legislation will be submitted, and when that is done the bill will go to the full committee, and the committee will hold hearings or accept the recommendations of the special committee and determine whether or not it should proceed with efforts to get the legislation enacted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but the work of getting the facts, the pros and cons, and reporting the necessity in connection with the proposed legislation,

whether it is the juvenile delinquency subcommittee or the antitrust monopoly subcommittee, will be work carried on by subcommittees. It would be impossible to carry on the work otherwise.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why the reorganization law was enacted. Each standing committee was authorized to appoint 4 specialists, 2 clerks, and 4 clerical employees. Each standing committee of the Senate is provided with a total of \$95,000, which is appropriated each year, and which the committee can spend. That amount is to pay for the four specialists, or experts, the clerical assistants necessary, and for the purpose of holding hearings.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator would look at the calendar of the Committee on the Judiciary, he would find, in view of the very wide jurisdiction of the committee—and it is not the fault of the committee that Senators introduce many bills which are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary—that somewhere between 52 and 55 percent of all bills introduced in the Senate are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I know that the experience of the late Senator McCarran and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was, and I know that the experience of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] now is, that the regular staff of four professionals was not and is not able to do the work for the full committee, let alone all the subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me tell the Senator that before the Reorganization Act was passed I was chairman of the committee which considered all the private claims bills which the Committee on the Judiciary is now handling. I worked on that committee for 5 or 6 years, 4 of those years as chairman, and that committee handled all of this work at a total salary cost of \$3,600. I do not know how many clerks the Committee on the Judiciary has engaged in that work.

Aside from that, we are providing the Attorney General with almost \$100,000 to make studies of private claims bills before they come to the committee. We did not have that advantage before 1946, and I think we did a very good job. When I was chairman of the committee, we considered a large number of bills; 51 or 52 percent of the total number of bills passed by the Senate were reported by the then Claims Committee, of which I was privileged to be chairman. We had a great deal of work to do, yes, but we did the work ourselves, and we did not have numerous lawyers and clerks to do it. The Senators themselves did the work.

Nowadays it seems the order of the day to have attorneys and professional job seekers serving the committees, and to have the committees surrounded with a lot of clerical help. In addition to that, there seems to be a need to have somebody in the Attorney General's office do most of the work of investigating as to whether or not the special claims ought to be paid.

It is true Mr. President, that a lot of work has devolved on the Committee on the Judiciary because of the immigration laws which have been enacted. But the committee is especially provided with

assistants to do that work. Extra help to do that work is provided for the Subcommittee on Immigration. That personnel handles the work; it is not the staff of the regular committee that does it.

In addition to the 4 professionals and the 6 clerical employees whom the Committee on the Judiciary has, what is provided? There are 2 additional professional workers and 3 clerks, to carry the extra load the Senator has just been discussing.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, if the employees of the Committee on the Judiciary were to do the work assigned to them, there would be ample help available in the present force.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say I do not know of any Senate employees who work harder than do the employees of the Committee on the Judiciary. They are busy all day. I know that many of them work at night. Many of them work very, very long hours.

It may be that when the Senator was handling claims bills, he was able to get more done than the present members of the committee are able to do, but I submit the burden of work on the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and on every member of the committee is very, very taxing, because as to every one of the claim bills, even though assistants are provided, the claimants want so see committee members and be heard. The same is true of immigration bills. I do not think the committee would be able to function at all, considering the burden of proposed legislation it carries, unless it had subcommittees and adequate staffs.

The Senator referred to the immigration subcommittee. That is one of the subcommittees requesting funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my friend from Tennessee that I am not questioning each one of the requests. I know it is necessary to increase some of the amounts previously provided. I know that. But the committee keeps burdening itself with more and more subcommittees. That is what I do not understand. As I pointed out a short time ago, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate would, standing by itself, be the first standing committee to have available over \$1 million with which to operate this year. It would be the first committee to reach that level of expenditure, and I submit that it is a dubious distinction, indeed. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it is unconscionable. I am saying, Mr. President, that, if this matter were looked into by the chairman and others, probably 40 percent of that amount could be saved, and the work could be done just as well as it is being done now, or better.

Mr. President, I do not wish to go into all the resolutions in detail, but I should like to call attention to one in particular, and that is the one embodying the request of the juvenile delinquency subcommittee. That subcommittee was created 2 years ago, at the request of former Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey.

As I did when other new subcommittees were formed, I questioned the advisability of creating that special subcommittee. I do not suppose there is a problem confronting us that is better known than is the subject of juvenile delinquency. However, it should be considered more or less on the local level.

When the resolution was presented, the former distinguished Senator from New Jersey asked for \$44,000. In debate, he stated to the Senate—and I was present—that he felt confident that if the Senate would give him that amount of money, he could complete the investigation and could make his report to the Senate. By the way, Mr. President, when my good friend, Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey, made a further request, last year, for additional funds for this purpose, he acknowledged that he was in error when he said he could complete the investigation with only \$44,000. At that time he made the following confession:

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator from New Jersey is the author of this resolution, I have no doubt that he will be appointed a member of the subcommittee. So I hope he will come to the Senate next year without a request for more funds.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I sincerely hope that I shall be able to come before the Senate and report exactly the result which the Senator from Louisiana wishes.

Mr. President, what happened? The subcommittee was organized. It spent the \$44,000; and at the beginning of last year it returned to the Senate with a request for an additional \$175,000. At that time I stood on the floor of the Senate and reminded Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey, of what he had previously stated. I tried to have the requested \$175,000 cut in half, because I felt that the only thing the subcommittee could do would be merely to dramatize the evils of juvenile delinquency; that the subcommittee could not do much about the problem; because it had to be dealt with more or less on the local level.

After considerable skirmishing and debate, the Senate rejected the amendment I suggested, and gave to the Hendrickson subcommittee the full sum of \$175,000.

The subcommittee got busy. It held hearings in many of the large cities throughout the Nation; and at the beginning of this year, it submitted to the Senate a report of its findings. The subcommittee did not discover anything new, anything we did not already know. The subcommittee reported on a plan which would, in effect, help in the fight against this evil.

I have before me a clipping from the Washington Star of March 11, 1955—soon after the report was issued. In the article it is stated that 13 recommendations were made by the subcommittee. After studying the problem for a whole year, in addition to the 6 or 8 months during which it had studied it previously, the subcommittee made certain specific recommendations. It recommended, according to the article to which I have referred:

1. Federal aid to schools, "the Nation's first line of defense in preventing juvenile delinquency."

That was one of the recommendations. I now read the others, as reported in this article:

2. Federal grants of "risk capital" to set up demonstration projects in fighting juvenile delinquency.

3. Establishment of a Federal revolving fund to finance costs of returning the more than 200,000 runaway youngsters that burden States other than their own.

4. More and better probation, parole, and social case workers in all institutions and organizations dealing with juveniles—Federal, State, and local.

5. Federal assistance in training such workers.

6. Federal strengthening of laws requiring a runaway father to support his wife and children. This would include putting the District under the reciprocal nonsupport law.

7. Banning the transportation of pornography across State lines by any method. Federal law today prohibits the transport of such material by mail or common carrier. There is no Federal law prohibiting such transport in trucks or private cars.

8. Finding ways to get communities to develop programs to provide youngsters with jobs.

9. Giving juvenile courts, under attack from some quarters, a chance to prove their worth. This would include, the subcommittee said, providing enough well trained social workers to do the job for which juvenile courts were designed.

10. Getting children out of common jails.

11. Better cooperation among the various agencies, national and local, concerned with juvenile delinquency.

12. New laws against trafficking in narcotics and adoptions.

13. Codification of Federal laws for the treatment of juvenile offenders.

All those suggestions or recommendations, as I have read them in brief, were incorporated in detail in the subcommittee's report.

What do we find, Mr. President? After the subcommittee and its predecessors spent more than a year and one-half in making these studies, we now find that the Judiciary Committee wishes to continue the subcommittee.

I should like to read for the RECORD a brief article which appeared at the time the subcommittee was organized:

KILGORE GETS PLACE KEFAUVER WANTED

Senate Judiciary Chairman HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat of West Virginia, yesterday took over control of that group's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, edging out Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who was eager to get the post.

There have been recurring reports—and recurring denials—that Senate Democratic leaders were eager to keep KEFAUVER out of that potential headline-getting post, which could serve as a build-up for the 1956 Presidential campaign.

A KEFAUVER associate said yesterday, however, that he had seen no evidence of any "ganging up" by the Democratic leadership to keep the Senator out of that job. Associates did not deny, however, that KEFAUVER, a leading critic of "power monopolies," was anxious to head the subcommittee.

KEFAUVER will be second-ranking member on the antitrust unit, which also includes Senators THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., Democrat, of Missouri; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming; ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin; WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota; and EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois.

KEFAUVER drew the chairmanships of the subcommittees on Juvenile Delinquency, and Constitutional Amendments.

Just listen to that, Mr. President—as though the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee were a permanent subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Mr. President, that is going the limit.

Because of the delay in reporting the resolutions from the Judiciary Committee, I was in hope that the new chairman of the committee would make a study of this entire matter and would try to eliminate a good deal of the expense. But what do we find? As I have already stated today, the chairman of the committee has come forth with proposals which will make available to the Judiciary Committee in excess of \$1 million for its operations. I say that is wrong. It is money wasted. Something should be done about it. I am pleading with the Senate to do something about it today.

Mr. President, I contend that to date we have had sufficient hearings on the problem of juvenile delinquency. The subcommittee spent \$44,000 in 1953, and \$175,000 in 1954; and now it wishes to have an additional \$154,000 to do more work in that field, notwithstanding the fact that the subcommittee has already made abundant recommendations about what should be done in order to assist in the fight against this evil of child delinquency.

It strikes me that what ought to be done by those who are interested, particularly by Senators who served on that committee—and I am sure the Senator from Tennessee is familiar with the report, because he was a member of the committee—is to consider the report, and perhaps implement it with legislation, if that should be done. However, nothing further can be gained, by giving the committee \$154,000 more to parade all over the country seeking information which it already has in its files. To my way of thinking that is a pure waste of money, and it ought to be stopped.

As I previously indicated, a great many subjects are considered in the report. With respect to Indian juvenile delinquency there are 1½ pages of recommendations; two pages of recommendations with respect to runaway children; recommendations of 3 or 4 pages on the subject of narcotics; 3 or 4 pages on the subject of lewd literature. There are family support recommendations, recommendations with respect to juveniles in the Armed Forces, youth delinquency in public housing, juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia, and so forth. I do not know of any facet of juvenile delinquency which has not been covered by the subcommittee. Why should we vote to give the subcommittee \$150,000 more to permit it to continue to hold hearings when all it could do would be to again parade around the country and spend the taxpayers' money?

Of course, it is possible to dramatize some of this evil. Television and radio are great media for dramatizing the problem of juvenile delinquency. If I fail in trying to persuade the Senate to vote outright against this resolution, I shall certainly seek to reduce the appropriation by a considerable amount, because, as I previously stated, the only

thing left to be done is to dramatize the problem. When I sought to reduce the appropriation for 1954 I presented facts and figures to show that it would require less than half of what was then being asked for the dramatization I have referred to. I submit that a similar situation exists today. We should learn by experience.

As each resolution comes up, Mr. President, I plan to ask a few questions regarding the amount of money which it is proposed to appropriate.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that there has been some discussion in relation to the funds desired for juvenile delinquency investigations. On March 5, I was unable to appear to testify before the subcommittee which was making up the budget for that appropriation.

I personally feel that the allocation of funds proposed in the resolution is very sound and in the public interest. Few problems, in my opinion, are more disturbing to the average American than those affecting our youngsters, many of whom are committing crimes. One million youngsters in this country might very well be saved if the hearts and souls of America were put into the fight.

The committee which is to take charge of this investigation will have the benefit of a certain momentum already created. We have learned from past experience that congressional committees create a certain public momentum, but even that momentum dies when the investigation expires.

My view is that in the attack against juvenile delinquency this momentum must not be lost. The various remedial measures which have been begun in the States, and at the Federal level, should be vigorously pursued. The existence of the committee for the duration of this year and the first month of 1956 is, in my opinion, absolutely vital, not only to protect the lives of youngsters, but to protect the Government. These youngsters will take over the Government in the future. This will be their Government. The lives we save may mean the saving of the Nation.

I am sure that Senators recognize, from their own experience, that there are many pitfalls along life's highway. I know of no greater function of the legislative branch than the investigation function when it is nobly undertaken and performed.

I wish to add my voice in urging approval of the appropriation for this particular committee.

HIGHWAY BUILDING PROGRAMS

Mr. SYMINGTON obtained the floor. Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was hoping we might bring the pending resolution to a vote. Most of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have been on the resolution dealing with juvenile delinquency. That is not the one which is now pending. It is coming up later. I was hopeful that we might dispose of the pending resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to make a few comments on another subject.

Mr. President, knowing of the great interest in the various highway building programs now being studied by the appropriate committees in the House and the Senate, I wish to read to the Senate a letter just received from a man whose support and leadership for better roads is of long standing, Missouri's No. 1 citizen, a former Member of this body and one of our greatest Presidents, Hon. Harry S. Truman:

MY DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: In that you are on the Public Roads Subcommittee, I am writing you my views on the improvement and modernization of the highways of the United States.

My interest in transportation and communication is as lively as it ever was, so that I have noted with approval the consideration being given the bills pending in the Congress to modernize our major highways within 10 years. I repeat, I have a very great interest in transportation and communication.

Every citizen agrees with me that the need to bring our roads and streets up-to-date is urgent. The longer we wait, the greater the cost will be.

Every year our outdated and wornout roads cost us time and money; and, much more important, they cost us lives. Traffic accidents and road congestion together cost us billions of dollars and thousands of lives every year.

I have always been interested in traffic safety. In 1946 I called a National Safety Conference to try to find a way to stop death and destruction by highway accidents. Safety conferences were held yearly on the call of the President after the first one.

Since returning to Missouri, I have been saddened by the number of people who die, every year, on the highways of this great State.

We all know that roads properly built to meet modern highway traffic conditions can help materially to reduce accidents. The saving of life and limb alone would justify the cost of modernizing our road system as quickly as possible.

Of course, it will take a big capital outlay to build a modern highway system. Solutions to fiscal problems are never easy, but I am sure we can all see the wisdom of this investment in the future of this great country. It is one that will bring immediate dividends in the convenience, efficiency and, above all, safety to highway travel and transportation.

Our improved standard of living and vast economic expansion, which accompanied the tremendous growth of highway transportation over the past 40 years are due in large part to the Federal-aid program first enacted in 1916, under a Democratic administration and subsequently extended and enlarged, always on a public service and not on a partisan basis.

The 84th Congress will have few better opportunities to advance the welfare of the American people than by making possible the large scale and rapid development of our highway system. I hope the Congress will take advantage of this opportunity.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Because he made so many other contributions to our Nation and to the free world, history probably will not list Harry S. Truman as a great road builder, but that is the field of public service in which he first earned State, national, and international recognition.

For reasons so adequately stated in his letter, Mr. Truman knows from first hand experience that money spent wisely for roads and highways is not an expense, but one of the best investments that can be made.

In the years from 1927 to 1934, as presiding judge of the county court, the chief administrative office of Jackson County, Mo., Mr. Truman initiated and carried through to successful completion a road system equaled by not more than 1 or 2 other counties in the United States.

Under Judge Truman's leadership, Jackson County was literally taken out of the mud.

An all-weather road served every farm, and no farm was more than 2 miles from a concrete highway—an almost unbelievable achievement 25 years ago.

Building highways was not a matter of partisan politics to Mr. Truman. He retained the best professional staff available under a bipartisan board of engineers. Contracts were let through true competitive bidding to the lowest and best bidders.

Mr. Truman's vision and leadership of 25 years ago resulted in much more rapid development of the rural areas of this county than would otherwise have been possible.

As our former President drives, each day, over these roads from his home in Independence, to his office in Kansas City, to the family farm near Grandview, I am sure he takes justifiable pride in the fact that these roads were the best investment, dollar for dollar, ever made by his county, and that the roads have long since paid for themselves in increased wealth in the area they serve.

Mr. Truman's interest in good roads extended far beyond his home county. Even before he became United States Senator, while still a county judge, he was elected president of a national road association. As shown by his letter read here this afternoon, his support for good roads and highways is unabated. He still believes in building not only for the present but for the future. Would that we had more leaders with such vision and courage.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was glad to hear the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri read the letter from former President Harry Truman, who has contributed so much to the cause of good roads. It is particularly fitting that we should receive a message from him in that cause. The Subcommittee on Roads is holding long hearings. We hope we are beginning to see the end of the hearings. I think I can say to the Senate with assurance that it will receive from the Committee on Public Works a good road bill, representing the composite views of the committee, a bill of which the Senate may be proud.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I made this morning before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Public Works Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I appreciate very much the invitation of this committee to appear before you with respect to S. 1160.

I know of no more important legislation now pending in this Congress.

Permit me to say at the beginning of my remarks that I have spent a good portion of my life working for sound expansion of highways. In 1915 I went to the State Senate of Virginia, where I served for 10 years. I became Chairman of the Virginia Senate Road Committee. I was a patron of the bill to establish the first State highway system in Virginia, and introduced a bill providing for a 3-cent gasoline tax, which was, at that time, the highest gasoline tax imposed by any State.

As Governor of Virginia one of my major efforts was to improve our road system. Virginia is a pay-as-you-go road State. Not a single road bond has been issued by the State since 1835. Virginia is 1 of the 4 States of the Union which construct and maintain every public road in the State, thus relieving the localities of all road expense. This has been done from revenue derived from the gasoline tax and license tax. Our present tax is 6 cents for gasoline and \$10.00 for license. Our road system in Virginia is creditable, and the Federal records show that of the 54,240 miles in the State highway system, all except 2,942 miles are surfaced.

I am fully conscious of the need for a greatly accelerated road program to meet the new conditions of travel. I am not before your committee today in a spirit of criticism of highway improvement, except to point out what to me appears to be the errors of the pending legislation. I am prepared to support sound measures to modernize our road systems. Furthermore, I would like to say that the pending road bill treats Virginia fairly. The National Highway program as set forth under Senate bill 1160 allots Virginia 908 miles, somewhat more than an average State.

I want to make it very clear that my objections to Senate bill 1160 do not come from either a lack of appreciation of the need for very substantial sums for road improvement or any feeling that the program as such does not deal fairly with Virginia. My objections are based on fundamental reasons why I am convinced that S. 1160 is unsound and unwise in its present form.

The policy for modern highway development was established with the adoption of the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916.

This act recognized the need for highways to carry motor vehicle traffic smoothly across State lines, but it clearly recognized that highway accommodation to communities and people within the States is of equal if not overriding importance. There is no such thing as a purely interstate road. All highways must serve local as well as interstate traffic.

The wisdom and proof of this policy has been established by nearly 40 years of State-Federal cooperation in highway construction, maintenance, and policing.

The tenets of this policy have been built into our governmental system, our revenue system, our transportation system, and our economic system.

Since Congress first began appropriating to highways in 1916, the funds have been used in cooperation with the States on a matching basis. This bill proposes that the Federal Government pay virtually 100 percent of the interstate system cost.

Throughout all these 39 years to date, basic highway controls have remained in the States, and in Congress the Federal policy has been subject to at least biennial review by the Congress.

To date every dollar of the \$13 billion of Federal appropriations, so far made for roads, has been subject to statutory review in authorization legislation, budgetary control, appropriation procedure, and all of it has been paid out of general revenue as expenditures within application of the Federal statutory debt limit.

Over the same period the States and localities have spent close to \$80 billion.

From these figures it is seen that in 39 years, nearly half of which have been depression and war periods, the States and the Federal Government have spent \$90 billion to \$95 billion for highway construction.

I mention these facts simply to indicate that our present policy is capable of producing not only expansion, but also improvement in other aspects of the problem.

It is my own opinion that the present situation does not justify the violent departures from fiscal fundamentals and our traditional principles of government proposed in this administration bill.

Senate bill 1160 will, if adopted, change drastically the methods of road construction, both with State funds and with Federal funds. The range of implications in this legislation is extensive.

1. In my judgment, if Senate bill 1160 is enacted in its present form, it will destroy sound budgetary procedure and take the longest step yet toward concentrating power in the Federal Government.

2. It abolishes the State matching formula, which has existed since 1916. It turns over to the Federal Government control of 40,000 miles of our most important roads heretofore under the control of the 48 States.

3. It gives to certain States large windfall refunds for existing roads which will be refunded to the States on a basis that will result in great injustice as between them.

4. It is based upon the erroneous conclusion that the interstate system as established by this bill will meet the needs for a period of 32 years. It would dry up the gasoline tax for road improvement on this system from 1966 to 1987 in order to pay the bonds and the interest thereon. It apparently assumes that no new road development on the interstate system will be necessary in this 22-year period.

5. It establishes a Government corporation without income or assets and authorizes this corporation to borrow \$21 billion for 32 years without declaring it as a debt, and by ledger-dollars excludes this debt from the debt limitation fixed by Congress. The interest will be \$11.5 billions, or 55 percent of the funds borrowed.

6. It provides for payment of principal and interest on these bonds with permanent indefinite appropriations, which removes the corporation from annual appropriation control by Congress.

7. It gives the corporation authority to draw from the Treasury at any time during the next 32 years additional amounts up to \$5 billion outstanding at one time without going through any appropriation action by Congress.

8. It attempts to convert what was originally intended to be a temporary excise tax on gasoline for general revenue purposes into a permanent special tax, irrevocably dedicated to a single specified purpose.

It is to me fantastic to think that in this 22-year period there will be no need for road development. The construction of roads is a continuing process. A secondary road today may be an interstate road tomorrow and vice versa. Requirements for roads never stand still.

A superficial glance at the map of this interstate system makes it absurd to think 40,000 miles will be the ironbound limit over the period of 32 years. I suspect the mileage will be increased quickly when it is found that the system bypasses the capitals of six

States and many important areas are omitted.

This Federal corporation will borrow money for roads outside the Federal debt limit and spend it without regard to budgetary control and appropriation procedure. Should this be approved, it will certainly be followed by other proposals to finance endless outlays in a similar manner. If a dummy corporation can be established by Congress to borrow \$21 billion for roads, and this corporation has neither assets nor income, then why cannot other corporations be established to feed on dedicated liquor taxes or the cigarette taxes and scores of other taxes now being levied by the Federal Government.

Returning to the methods, procedures, and techniques proposed to finance this \$25 billion road corporation, it is my sincere conviction that the proposal is incapable of honest Federal bookkeeping and accounting. It contemplates a dual set of books. In one, the ordinary operations of Government subject to debt, budgetary, and appropriation control will be disclosed. In the other the extraordinary functions of the Government, as set forth in this legislation, with special privileges to evade sound financing requirements, will be concealed.

In these days when we are continuously piling up debt to be paid by our children and grandchildren, the least we can do is to keep the books honest and make full disclosure of the obligations we are incurring.

There probably was never a corporation—public or private—with assets so small and liabilities so large as proposed in Senate bill 1160. Neither it nor the Federal Government will even own the rights-of-way or the roadbeds on which the money is to be spent.

We must remember that we cannot avoid financial responsibility by ledger-dollars, nor can we evade debt by definition. The earmarking of a tax over a long period of years is of very questionable legality and, in my judgment, even if legal, it is poor practice. Whenever you begin to earmark taxes out of the general revenue, then such a practice will be continued for other purposes and thereby the authority of Congress over appropriations would be destroyed.

I have sought an opinion from Mr. John Simms, Chief of the Senate Legislative Counsel, as to the legality of earmarking future proceeds from a specific tax for the payment of a debt created by a Government corporation. Here are the questions I propounded:

1. Prior to the time all obligations of the corporation have been retired, can the Congress reduce or repeal the taxes imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and thus eliminate the base for computing the permanent indefinite appropriation?

2. Prior to the time all obligations of the corporation have been retired, can Congress reduce or repeal the permanent appropriation provided in section 105 (b)?

ANSWER BY JOHN H. SIMMS

"It seems elementary that one Congress, or one law enacted by a Congress, cannot completely foreclose action by a subsequent Congress, or by a subsequent law of the same Congress. To so hold would be to say that once a policy had been enunciated by the Congress it is not susceptible to change. That is not to say, however, that a subsequent Congress is always left with an unlimited realm of action. Rights may have accrued under a law which cannot be validly divested. But the power of each Congress to enact legislation for future application cannot be eliminated by action of a prior Congress. A change of policy by a Congress, effected by amending or repealing previously enacted laws, may give rise to causes of action by persons whose vested rights are thereby adversely affected, but unless the policy change is invalid in all aspects, the

power of the Congress to make the change is not destroyed by previous enactments. For example, the next Congress could reduce the amount of indebtedness which the Corporation is authorized to incur, or could provide a different method of financing with respect to obligations subsequently issued by the Corporation.

"It should be noted that the bill does not appropriate the moneys in excess of \$622,500,000 collected under sections 4081 and 4041 of the 1954 Code, but an amount equal to the moneys collected in excess of such amount. While the obvious purpose is to earmark these revenue collections, the bill does not attempt to prescribe the tax rates under these sections of the 1954 Code nor to foreclose a change in the rates.

"The statement in section 2 of the bill can be taken as no more than a statement of policy by the present Congress, in fact, only of the present Congress at the time this bill is enacted. Each Congress has power to make changes in the tax laws which it deems desirable. Likewise, each Congress has power to appropriate such moneys as it deems desirable to provide for the operation of the Government and to satisfy the debts of the United States.

"The answers to these two questions are in the affirmative. Each Congress has power to repeal or reduce, at any time, the taxes imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code and to reduce or repeal, at any time, the permanent appropriation made by section 105 (b) of the bill. For the same reasons, the Congress could not be compelled to increase the amount of the permanent appropriation should it prove insufficient to meet the debt service requirements of the corporation."

So it is very evident that the gasoline tax cannot be legally earmarked over a period of years, nor can permanent appropriations be made beyond the power of Congress to change them, with the definite result that the proceeds of this tax can be made available to pay off these bonds and the interest.

Camouflage it all you please, the bonds issued by this corporation will be a Federal debt, and a general obligation of the Government. It would be absurd for this corporation to attempt to issue bonds unless the Federal Government would guarantee them for the simple reason that unless this were so the bonds would be unsaleable. Those who buy bonds by the billions of dollars in value do not do so unless their validity and security are assured.

I point now to one glaring inconsistency in this bill, and that is that while one clause of the bill states the bonds are not guaranteed by the Federal Government, there is another provision that gives the Government the right to sell these bonds to Government-trust funds.

It is unthinkable to me that the Congress would authorize legislation to permit bonds not guaranteed by the Federal Government to be sold to its trust funds, such as the social security for which the Government is a trustee with all of the responsibility that a trusteeship carries.

It is idle, I think, to take time to discuss the question whether this is a legal debt of the United States Government. If it is not a legal debt the whole enterprise will fall because the bonds simply cannot be sold.

Here is an opinion by the Comptroller General of the United States holding that the bonds would be a legal debt of the Government—that the bonds will not be self-liquidating, and the funds for paying off the bonds would have to come from the general fund of the Treasury:

FEBRUARY 17, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In response to your request of February 11, 1955, attached herewith is a condensed summary of the methods used to finance the activities of the various Federal corporations now in existence and

certain other agencies engaged in business-type activities. Also, as requested, there is attached as a separate memorandum a more detailed summary of the financing arrangements of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

You also inquired as to whether or not the Government has ever used a financing arrangement such as is proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in its report of January. That proposal called for the creation of a new Government corporation to be known as the Federal Highway Corporation and an authorization for it to issue bonds in an amount sufficient to cover the Federal share of the cost of constructing the proposed interstate system of roads over a construction period of 10 years.

While the terms and conditions of the Corporation's bonds would be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the plan calls for their repayment from funds provided by the Treasury as authorized by the Congress annually (presumably by appropriation action), the plan does not specifically provide that such bonds be guaranteed by the Secretary of the Treasury. However, all related factors plus the fact that they are to be issued by a Federal corporation would have the same effect. The total amount of such borrowings from the public would amount to \$25 billion. The Corporation's activities would not be self-liquidating, it would have no important revenues, and funds for paying off the bonds would have to come from the general funds of the Treasury.

Insofar as we are aware, such a financing arrangement for a Federal expenditure program of the scale and magnitude contemplated for the proposed Federal Highway Corporation has never been used by the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

It is obvious to me that this Corporation will have supreme power over the construction, the operation, and everything else in connection with the 40,000 miles of interstate road. The authority of the States will be clearly abdicated. The legislation specifically provides that in cases of dispute between States and Federal authorities, the Corporation will decide in the nature of a supreme court. This absolute final Federal authority over the vital roads in all the States is a very serious matter.

This program envisages right-of-way of up to 255 feet and access to the roads will be extremely limited. It is proposed to use existing routes, which have been in long use and naturally, they have accumulated business operations of all kinds. A 255-foot right-of-way will necessitate the removal of thousands and thousands of buildings, or the bypassing of many of these areas. I can appreciate the fact that cities, because of congested traffic, can and should at times be bypassed, but the same conditions do not apply to towns and rural areas.

I have been told by our Virginia State Highway Commission that one of the main routes, from Winchester to Bristol, would have to be relocated, certainly over one-half its length, and this relocation would mean that investments to the extent of millions of dollars along these rights-of-way to service the traveling public would be rendered valueless.

While it is not clearly defined, it is apparently provided that all concessionaires such as restaurants, filling stations, motels, etc., may be licensed and there is indication in the report that license fees will be charged. But, I emphasize that whatever may be said today as to the powers of this highway corporation, such powers would be virtually unlimited. They can move the roadbed. They can establish a license system for all

concessions and charge fees, or anything else they choose to do within the right-of-way limit.

To those who deny this, I would like to ask: Where are the safeguards in this legislation to prevent the Federal Government from exercising this conclusive and dictatorial control if it chooses to do it?

I want to make clear also that this legislation will be permanent. There is no recovery of the power we would be giving away over our roads and the activities that exist along these roads.

I have searched the records and nothing comparable to this legislation, in its magnitude, has ever been suggested in the way of increasing the concentration of power at Washington.

I call to the attention of the committee the language of section 207B on page 20 of the bill.

This provides that for toll roads completed prior to December 31, 1951, within the interstate system there shall be allowed as a credit to the State an amount not exceeding 40 percent of the original cost. For toll roads completed during the period between December 31, 1951, and December 31, 1955, the State will receive a credit not exceeding 70 percent of the original cost. For a toll highway constructed after December 31, 1955, the State will receive 90 percent of the cost of construction.

It is difficult to determine from the report the extent of these refunds, but in my opinion, they will certainly run into many billions of dollars.

The report states that on the interstate system there are 1,058 miles of toll roads now in operation, and the refund formula will be from 40 to 70 percent of cost of the roads taken into the system.

The report states there are 1,247 miles under construction or financed. It is likely that these roads which go into the system will certainly receive either 70 or 90 percent credit.

The report then states there are 3,854 miles authorized, and this category will receive credit of either 70 or 90 percent.

The report lists additional proposals of 3,578 miles, and in this category the refunds to the States will certainly be 90 percent.

As toll roads are costing on an average of \$1 million a mile, this will involve refunds on a basis of an approximate cost of \$8.5 billion.

But the bill goes further. Section 207C is an invitation to every State to construct more and more toll roads on the interstate system, which will not be paid for out of State funds but by revenue bonds secured on the revenue of the turnpike. The State will then receive 90 percent of the cost of these roads built any time in the future—now or 10 years from now—all such refunds to be expended outside of the interstate system without matching.

When the State receives this refund, it can decide whether to pay off the revenue bonds and free the roads of tolls, or use the money, without matching, on other roads. The decision, in my opinion, will be unanimous not to pay the revenue bonds off on the toll roads, but to use the money for other construction.

I agree with the American Automobile Association when it called these refunds "a reimbursement bonanza" which would practically force the States to go into the toll business.

No one can predict the amount of refunds under this section in the years to come, but it is obvious that they will be great and concentrated in certain States. This will bring about an unequal distribution of the Federal funds to States that have constructed toll roads.

In addition to these refunds I have mentioned, it is further provided that any free-ways constructed by any State that comply

with standards set forth in the bill can likewise receive refunds.

When it is considered that \$21 billion is to be borrowed; interest will be \$11.5 billion; and that there will be billions of dollars in refunds, as permitted under this legislation, we must conclude the actual funds to be expended on new construction will be greatly diminished.

In my opinion, the refund provision is one of the more iniquitous provisions of this legislation, and it is especially indefensible because those testifying in favor of the bill have not been able to estimate the amount of refunds.

In conclusion, I want to express my support of a sound pay-as-you-go plan of road improvement. The request has frequently been made by the governors of the States that the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax be repealed. This is certainly one way greatly to promote the road program. Should it be repealed, and the present Federal aid to States be continued, amounting to \$525 million a year over the period of the life of this program, there would be a far greater sum available for road improvement than under the plan proposed in this bill.

A continued direct appropriation of \$525 million annually out of the Federal Treasury, and the reimposition by the States of the 2-cent gasoline tax, if removed by the Federal Government, will bring in an additional revenue of \$39 billion to the States during the 32-year period if the estimates of the President's Advisory Committee are correct.

I do not think there is a single State in the Union that would not be ready to reimpose the 2-cent tax after the repeal of this tax by the Federal Government.

I suggest as one solution of the problem that:

1. The 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long standing match basis. This amounts to \$535 million a year.

3. The lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

Under such a plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; \$11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Missouri has read the letter dealing with the activities of former President Truman pertaining to roads. I believe Congress is still pursuing the idea former President Truman had in mind when he was building roads in Jackson County. In giving credit where credit is due, I believe that credit should be given, even at this late date, to a man who back in the year 1916 represented the State of Arizona in the House of Representatives. If we are to give credit to the men who got America out of the mud, let us give credit to the Senator who sits on my right, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is the father of roads in this country. He was the initiator of the original bill. He made it possible for the Committee on Public Works, of which I am now chairman, and the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], to continue our work.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe that credit should also be given to former Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, who was the right hand man of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in the matter of building roads in America.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely correct. In the early days when one had to face stern realities, it was the old timers, such men as Senator HAYDEN and former Senator McKellar, who did the real work. I wish to give credit to Senator HAYDEN for getting us out of the mud. To him the United States of America owes a great deal.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

COMMERCIAL AIR SERVICE BETWEEN NEW YORK CITY AND MEXICO CITY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it was not my intention this afternoon to discuss in detail the subject I have in mind, but I wish to say a few words on it. Uncle Sam is the easiest victim of foreign ideas and of foreign powers that anyone can think of. I wish to discuss briefly the question of air flights from New York City to Mexico City. Senators know that it is not possible to fly direct in an American airplane from New York to Mexico City; but do they know that it is not possible to board an American airplane in Mexico City and ride nonstop to New York City? Let me tell the Senate what the situation is. I hold in my hand a recent news report. It is quoted from the American Aviation Daily of March 3, 1955.

Senators like to boast about being Americans. I ask them to listen to this:

During its first year of operation with traffic rights between New York and Mexico City (through Jan. 14, 1955), Air France—

This is not Eastern Air Lines or American Air Lines or Pan American Airways, or TWA, but Air France—

carried 26,000 passengers between the two cities. It offered 80,960,000-passenger miles, and sold 68,350,000, corresponding to an average load factor of 82 percent.

I have been at the airport in Mexico City, and I know what I am talking about. I have seen the situation. I have seen an American plane take off with 18 passengers, and I have seen Air France airplanes take off loaded to full capacity.

The article states that Air France has just finished a good year in operating between New York and Mexico City. It carried 26,000 passengers between the 2 cities, for a total of 63,350,000 passenger miles.

Mr. President, I am not talking about flying from Paris to Mexico City. I am not talking about flying from a French colonial possession in North Africa to Mexico City. I am talking about flying from an American city to Mexico City.

That is fine for Air France, Mr. President. Behind this news clipping lies an extraordinary story of bungling by someone in the United States Government. It is not right. It is not fair.

Senators who are about to vote more than a million dollars for an investigation, certainly must be interested in the taxpayers' dollar.

While this French airline has a large and profitable business between New York City and Mexico City, the United States-flag airline with a New York-Mexico City route is losing money on its Mexican service.

The reason is that the United States airline is not permitted—not by France, but by its own Government—to operate nonstop between New York City and Mexico City.

Do Senators realize the impact of such a situation? A passenger can board a foreign airline plane in New York and fly nonstop to Mexico City. Those flights are paid for with American dollars. That cannot be done on an American plane. The reason is that the United States airline is not permitted by our own Government to operate nonstop between New York City and Mexico City. That right has been given by our Government to the French carrier. That is my complaint.

What the airlines need is competition. If I have a ship and another man has a ship, we should be permitted to take on passengers, in competition with each other, with the idea that the best man will win in going after the business. That is good old American competition.

But now an American airline is not permitted to fly nonstop to Mexico City, while at the same time Uncle Sam gives a foreign airline permission to do just that. The United States carrier has to stop all its flights at Dallas and Fort Worth, while the French carrier is permitted to fly nonstop directly to Mexico City.

One result of this discrimination against the United States-flag service is that it takes at least 25 percent more time to make a round trip between New York and Mexico City on a United States flag carrier than it does by Air France. Naturally, the bulk of the passengers between New York and Mexico are now flying in the French planes.

How did this amazing situation arise? Why does this Nation discriminate against United States air transportation in favor of French airlines?

The answer to this question is certainly not to be found in the record of the pioneering of this service by the French. They did not pioneer. I recall years and years ago when our airlines in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico were trying to start a new business and bring about a new transportation situation. They were the ones who pioneered as far back as 1942 to 1945. I am proud of the fact that I contributed a little to get American Airlines into Mexico City.

The French are newcomers. The service was pioneered and developed under the United States flag. American Airlines has been operating between New York and Mexico City since 1942. It is not a "Johnny-come-lately." It built its air service to Mexico literally from scratch. Those boys were poor. They were pioneering, as our ancestors pioneered in the West. The company had to construct a complete airway system with landing fields, emergency fields,

ground installations, and radar stations, before it could even get started.

I recall to this day that at Monterey, Mexico, where General Taylor, of blessed memory, in the Mexican War made his name great, American Airlines, not Air France, with their own money, their own technique, and their own know-how, built an airport. The company had to do it at its own expense, in sharp contrast to the situation where the Government builds the airways, and in even sharper contrast to the situation which confronted Air France when it entered the New York-Mexico City market a little over a year ago, after the airway system was built.

Nor did our Government subsidize American Airlines. No one subsidized American Airlines. C. R. Smith and Red Mosher, and a number of other men in the West pioneered.

Its Mexican service has been operated continuously without subsidy even though on this route it has suffered operating losses which, on a cumulative basis, are now more than three-quarters of a million dollars. The New York-Mexico City traffic is the largest single source of revenue on this route.

When our Government authorized this United States service to Mexico it was required that every flight stop at Dallas-Fort Worth. Of course, at that time airplanes did not have the range which they now have. They could not have flown the distance between New York and Mexico City nonstop. So the required intermediate stop made no particular difference.

But with the great new modern aircraft such a nonstop operation became feasible, and as early as 1947—8 years ago—American Airlines applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for authority to operate nonstop between New York and Mexico City.

But the Civil Aeronautics Board sat on that application, refused to grant a hearing, and did nothing until last year, 7 years after the application was filed. Then it finally started a proceeding which has not yet been concluded. After 7 years, the Board is beginning to look into the matter, and eventually it may make a decision.

In the meantime, our Government dealt very differently with Air France. I want Senators to get mad about it; I really do.

In July of 1951 Air France filed an application for nonstop flights between New York and Mexico City. This was 4 years after American Airlines had filed its application. But within 6 months the Civil Aeronautics Board had completed its procedures on the Air France application and had authorized Air France to operate nonstop between New York and Mexico City. In spite of that action, the Civil Aeronautics Board still sat on the application of American Airlines for the same service and did absolutely nothing for our own carrier.

Mr. President, someone might refer to me as an isolationist. It is not my intention to be, but when the showdown comes, believe me, I shall pick Uncle Sam every time. I cannot see any reason why our Government should discriminate in

favor of a foreign airline as against a pioneering airline of our own country.

It was not until January of 1954 that Air France was able to institute its New York-Mexico City service, because it was not until then that it received permission from the Mexican Government. In January of 1954 it did get permission and promptly began to carry traffic nonstop between New York and Mexico City.

Obviously, this gave a tremendous competitive advantage to the French airline. The United States airline, which had developed that traffic, was now compelled to fight for it with one hand tied behind its back. The result was exactly what might have been expected. The Air France operation was quickly increased to a daily service and the great time advantage which it enjoyed because of its nonstop rights enabled it almost immediately to capture most of the traffic.

Do Senators know who travel from New York to Mexico City on the French planes? American citizens. As I stated before, the service is paid for by American dollars. At this time the French airline carries nearly 4 times as many passengers as does the United States airline which spent 12 years building up the traffic before Air France ever began.

When the Air France operation was started, our Government finally began to move. The State Department recommended to the Civil Aeronautics Board that prompt action be taken to correct the competitive inequality, and at last the Civil Aeronautics Board began a proceeding on the American Airlines' application which it had been sitting on for 7 long years.

Talk about our friend from Kansas who spoke about the Democrats being in office for 4 long years? This is 7 long years.

In fairness to the Civil Aeronautics Board it should be pointed out that when it finally took action it tried to move promptly and it issued an exemption to permit American Airlines to begin nonstop operations immediately, to compete with Air France, pending the hearing on American's application. The Mexican Government, however, insisted that a similar right should be given a Mexican carrier and therefore refused to join in the immediate temporary authorization for American Airlines, so the Civil Aeronautics Board withdrew its temporary exemption.

The Civil Aeronautics Board then went ahead with its proceeding. Two other United States carriers entered the proceeding. These two were Eastern Air Lines and Pan American Airways who for many years had been providing a service between New York and Mexico City by connection at Houston.

Eastern Airlines flies to Houston; there it connects with Pan-American Airlines, which flies into Mexico City.

After months of delay a hearing was finally held before a CAB examiner in November of 1954 on the application of American Airlines, which by that time had been pending for 7½ years, and on the more recent applications filed by Eastern and Pan-American. The case is now being considered by the examiner, a Government employee, for whose sal-

ary Congress will be appropriating money one of these days.

But even after he makes his initial decision there will be further delay while the CAB reviews the examiner's decision and then submits the case to the President for his final determination. Therefore, while it can be hoped and expected that the case will now move speedily, it is clear that Air France will continue to enjoy its great competitive advantage over United States air transportation for several months more.

If the case moves with dispatch this gross discrimination by our own Government against United States flag air transportation will, of course, finally be corrected. It is high time that corrective action be taken. With nothing done for 7 years for our own carriers despite action taken for the benefit of the French in 6 short months, and with 8 years now having elapsed since the first application was filed by a United States carrier, the record of delay is one which our Government certainly cannot be proud of.

I hope the Government is not proud of it. It is not fair; it is not right.

Congress enacts tax laws and expects the Government to collect taxes. How do we expect Americans operating American companies to pay taxes if we prefer a foreign airline to an American airline, or if we do not permit, at least, keen competition?

It is impossible to understand how this state of affairs could ever have been permitted to arise. New York is more than 3,500 miles from France and Mexico City is an additional 2,000 miles away. The interest of the United States in traffic between New York and Mexico City on the other hand is the most direct interest conceivable. Not only has the traffic been pioneered and developed by United States air transportation, but the overwhelming majority of the passengers traveling between these cities are United States citizens. It is inconceivable that our Government could have an aviation policy which in the Western Hemisphere would discriminate in favor of a European airline and against our own airlines in the transportation of our own citizens. There is not another country on earth that would permit any such situation to arise or that would tolerate for one day such a gross discrimination against its own citizens.

I do not charge our Government with deliberately bringing about this state of affairs. I am sure that it is simply a case of bad bungling somewhere along the way. Yet I would suppose that in the course of 8 long years, during 7 of which our Government refused even to grant a hearing on an application filed by a United States airline, the bungling could have been corrected.

How this kind of thing can be prevented in the future I do not know. Perhaps there is too much opportunity for buck passing under the present division of responsibilities between the Civil Aeronautics Board, the State Department, and the White House in these international route matters. But whatever the trouble may be, it is clear that there has been a lack of vigor in pro-

tecting the United States and in moving speedily and directly to dispose of business pending entirely too long a time. Let us hope that the lack of vigor and the delays are matters of history and will not be repeated.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FURTHER EXPENDITURES AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing further expenditures and temporary employment of additional assistants by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask the Senator from Alabama if this is the same committee which investigated housing last year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee which investigated housing last year was the full Committee on Banking and Currency, and the investigation will again be carried on by that committee. It is not a special committee in any sense of the word.

It is the plan of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], to use the Subcommittee on Housing for the purpose of the investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to carry on the work of the subcommittee in respect to investigations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the subcommittee was organized in 1954.

Mr. SPARKMAN. An authorization and an appropriation were made in 1954 to enable the committee to conduct an investigation of the Federal Housing Administration. That investigation was made. We intend to carry on the investigation, but we intend to do something else, namely, to make a continuing study, which I think is contemplated by the Reorganization Act of 1946, of the whole field of housing, which, after all, is one of the biggest programs in which the Federal Government engages.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that Senate Resolution 229, of the 83d Congress, appropriated \$150,000 for such purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that has been used?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry I do not have the figures at my fingertips, but my recollection, which is subject to correction, is that there were two different resolutions. Under both of them a total of \$225,000 was appropriated, of which \$184,000 was used, if I remember correctly, leaving about \$41,000 unexpended. However, that authorization has expired,

and we are not asking for the reappropriation of the balance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is asking for \$100,000 of new money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; of new money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the same investigative and clerical force which served the previous subcommittee be used?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In part, but not altogether, because some of the personnel have already resigned and have returned to their former jobs; but we anticipate using personnel whom we hope to obtain from Government agencies on a reimbursable basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice, according to the showing made before the Committee on Rules and Administration, that it is hoped to have sufficient money with which to employ 1 chief counsel, 2 special counsel, and 2 investigators; and then I notice the item "editorial research." This follows the same pattern as is followed by other committees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is more or less typical nomenclature. Of course, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, in doing work such as this, a great deal of research, such as going back through the records and checking accounts, is required. The preparation of reports is also involved. All these activities are included in that particular nomenclature. But I think the Senator from Louisiana understands that a very general type of work is done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that provision is made for 16 employees. Can the Senator from Alabama state the number of extra employees hired by the standing Committee on Banking and Currency when the investigation of housing was made?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, I am sorry; I cannot. I am certain that it was a greater number than 16. I assure the Senator from Louisiana, and all other Senators, that this study and investigation—and I want to include both terms—will be as economically conducted as that which will be carried on by any other committee of Congress.

After all, this is a tremendous program, under which the Federal Government incurs a liability of something like, offhand, \$7.5 billion a year. I think an expenditure of \$100,000 for 1 year is a pretty good investment in watching the program. Even though nothing irregular be found, I think the amount asked would be well worthwhile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 57), as amended, was agreed to.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES RELATING TO INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 52, Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 58) to further increase the limit

of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds with the consideration of the resolutions reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Before the Senate proceeds to consider the resolutions which pertain to the Committee on the Judiciary, it seems only proper to bring to the attention of the Senate that each of these resolutions has the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary and are now before the Senate, having been reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary was increased tremendously, and, in addition to this, the functions formerly performed by the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Immigration, and the Committee on Patents were transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Beginning with the 80th Congress, the number of legislative proposals referred to the Committee has increased with each Congress. During the 80th Congress the Committee received over 1,500 bills and resolutions, which approximated 42 percent of the total legislation received in the Senate. During the 83d Congress the Committee received 3,000 bills and resolutions, which amounted to 49.8 percent of the total legislation received in the Senate.

There was referred to the Committee not only a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing Committee of the Senate, but of the 2,505 written reports filed with the Senate in the 83d Congress, the Judiciary Committee submitted 1,451 reports, representing 57.9 percent of all written reports filed.

However, these figures in nowise represent the sum total of Committee effort in relation to legislative activity. Committee consideration of many bills often results in adverse action and indefinite postponement, requiring the preparation of written reports on these measures which are not submitted to the Senate.

As can readily be seen, because of the amount of legislation which is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, increasing demands are made for conducting hearings on private relief bills, as well as those of a general nature. Naturally, to comply with such requests consumes time and requires necessary personnel to assist the Committee in processing these measures for consideration by the Committee and the subcommittees thereof.

During the more recent Congresses, the efforts of the committee have been expended on an increasing burden of legislation with respect to judicial proceedings, constitutional amendments, Federal courts and judges, revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, internal security, patents, copyrights and trade-marks, and immigration and naturalization.

Historically, the Congress has logically delegated the initial tasks of legislative preparation and formulation of legislative policy to its standing committees. Adequate professional and clerical assistance to the members of any committee has been demonstrated by experience to be an absolute necessity. The resolutions about to be considered are necessary in order to provide the Committee

on the Judiciary and its subcommittees with assistance in carrying out the legislative process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 58) to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments.

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee under S. Res. 366 of the Eighty-first Congress to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed \$260,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The additional amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, in the amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary, on page 2, line 12, after the word "committee", to strike out "under Senate Resolution 366 of the 81st Congress"; in line 25, after the word "the", to strike out "Internal Security Subcommittee of the", and on page 3, line 1, after the word "Judiciary", to insert "or any subcommittee thereof," so as to make the resolution read:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee to make a complete and continuing

study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956 (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed \$260,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a few questions about the resolution. Does it provide for a continuation of the internal security investigation which originated back in 1950?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. The Senate resolution which created the subcommittee was agreed to at that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that under Senate Resolution 366, of the 81st Congress, \$100,000 was asked for; under Senate Resolution 7 of the 82d Congress, \$85,000 was requested, and in the second session of the 82d Congress, \$95,000 was requested.

Last year, according to the record before me, \$170,000 was spent. When that request was made, there was a showing made in the report of how the money was going to be spent and the number of employees who were to be hired.

I am wondering if the Senator from Mississippi will tell us why it is necessary to raise the amount from \$170,000 to \$260,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. The difference is due to this factor: The total of \$221,000 which was available last year for the committee—

Mr. ELLENDER. How much was spent altogether last year?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am informed the amount was \$211,000. Does the Senator desire to know the reason—

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to ask why \$50,000 more is being requested.

Mr. EASTLAND. Several employees who were doing Internal Security Subcommittee work were on the staff of the Immigration Subcommittee. The chairman of the full committee thought that each subcommittee should have its own employees, with which I agreed, and the employees were transferred to the Internal Security Subcommittee.

There are a number of projects that will be investigated, and that will take more money. In addition, the subcommittee adopted, at the request of the full committee, new rules of procedure. I think it had been advocated pretty generally by the Senate that there should not be hearings unless at least two Senators were present. That necessity requires an increase in funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that? How will the necessity of having two Senators sit on committees require an increase in funds?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because when hearings are held out of town, 2 Senators instead of 1 will have to go. The committee and the Government Operations Subcommittee have adopted a uniform rule of procedure whereby the minority is to be provided with counsel. Heretofore the minority has not had counsel. Now it is entitled to counsel. Those are the reasons for the request for additional funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the staff, the investigators, the lawyers, and others connected with the investigation, be increased in number?

Mr. EASTLAND. The present staff has places for 28 employees. There are three vacancies on the staff. I expect to cut the staff down somewhat. However, the committee is going to be very effective this year. It is going to be very frugal with its expenditures. It is certainly going to live within the budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent will the Senator cooperate with the House Un-American Activities Committee, as well as the committee headed by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]? I read in the press some time ago that a meeting was held by the chairmen of the various committees, in the hope that something could be done to stop or prevent duplication.

Mr. EASTLAND. There will be no duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of that fact, is the Senator from Mississippi still of the opinion that he will need all the funds he is requesting?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am positive there will be no waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 58), as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing further expenditures relating to the internal security of the United States."

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 53, Senate Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand from the report which accompanies the resolution, the purpose of creating the subcommittee is to study evidence as well as recommendations which will be made by the Attorney General. It is stated in the report that the subcommittee will be organized in order to make such studies of the report of the Attorney General. I do not suppose anyone is familiar with the contents of the Attorney General's report.

I wonder whether the Senator from West Virginia will be willing to let the resolution remain on the calendar and await the report from the Attorney General. In that way it might be possible for us to determine the amount of work necessary to be done. As I understand, the Attorney General's report may be submitted soon—perhaps next week or next month. It seems to me that we should let the resolution remain on the calendar; and as soon as the report comes to us from the Attorney General, we can then consider the resolution anew.

I may state, Mr. President, that I am informed that a resolution similar to the one the Senate is now considering was before the Judiciary Committee for some time. I have before me a brief memorandum on it. The memorandum states that in the 82d Congress there was a resolution authorizing the appropriation of \$250,000 for antitrust investigations. Senator McCarran submitted Senate Resolution 86, to provide funds for a probe similar to the one we are now considering. That resolution was not reported by the Judiciary Committee.

In the 83d Congress, Senate Resolution 14, authorizing a similar study, was submitted, was approved by the committee, and was placed on the calendar; but it was never acted upon.

The resolution we are now discussing would, if agreed to, be the first specifically to provide funds for a full-fledged antitrust probe, although, as I have said before, last year the Judiciary Committee did not suggest the adoption of the resolution, which was then on the calendar.

So I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that, in light of the fact that the report shows that the subcommittee is being organized primarily for the purpose of studying the recommendations of the Attorney General, we permit the resolution to remain on the calendar and open for further consideration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Louisiana, let me say the subcommittee is a standing subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. By the Legislative Reorganization Act, there was placed on the Judiciary Committee the duty of going into all antitrust matters. At the last session of Congress, the subcommittee, with volunteer help—because no funds were available—made an investigation of

monopoly aspects in the power field and filed a subcommittee report. I believe the subcommittee had no working funds, and was assisted by a volunteer counsel.

Let me also say there is misapprehension about the recommendations to be submitted by the Attorney General. He appointed a committee—about 60 or 65 in number, I believe—to study the antitrust laws. That was done 2 years ago. The committee recently, so I was informed by the Attorney General, completed a report. I was also informed by a member of the committee that in the report there are some 65 recommendations as to changes in the antitrust laws, and that the report probably within a week will be printed and available for distribution.

That precipitated the necessity for us to have an organization ready to handle the report and the recommendations. Unless we are to accept blindly the recommendations of 60 unpaid, volunteer attorneys, many of whom may represent corporations which may have interests in the monopoly field, we believe it is necessary to study the report as soon as it is off the press. After all, if it took the Attorney General's committee 2 years to make their report, it follows that the recommendations in the report certainly merit a complete study by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I did not interrupt the Senator from Louisiana when he was speaking. So, if he will pardon me, I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator from West Virginia asked me a rather long question, and I should like to answer it.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Louisiana asked me a rather long question also.

Mr. President, that is the occasion at this time for believing it is necessary for us to be ready to deal with this matter. I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that we cannot pick from a shelf, somewhere, the experts who will be needed to study the antitrust laws. It is necessary to employ those who have no ax to grind, and who are experts in the field of antitrust legislation.

Furthermore, a veritable flood of mergers has begun, both in my own State of West Virginia and in many other States. That development is similar to the one which precipitated the 1929 depression, and also is similar to the one which precipitated the panic in 1880.

The Judiciary Committee believes that such a study is necessary; and after studying the proposed budget, the committee approved that budget as necessary, as did the Committee on Rules and Administration.

That is why I do not wish to have the committee wait. Apparently some of the lawyers have been talking about their recommendations, and I have seen résumés of the report in the Wall Street Journal and in other publications. Obviously it is necessary for us to be ready to take action, without waiting 2 years.

The Senator from Louisiana must realize that the Sherman Act has not been reviewed by Congress in 65 years, and the

Clayton Act has not been reexamined for a very long time, and the same is true of the Robinson-Patman Act. That is why I believe it is necessary for the committee to commence this work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to read from the report itself the reason advanced for the creation of the subcommittee. I do not object to a study being made of whatever findings the Attorney General may submit. What I am objecting to is the creation of the subcommittee now, in order to study what may come forward 3 or 4 months hence.

I read now from page 2 of the committee's statement:

Attorney General Brownell recognized the need for a study of the antitrust laws on June 26, 1953, in announcing the appointment of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. The Attorney General's committee is expected to report its recommendations for revision of the antitrust laws to the Congress some time next month. As the Committee on the Judiciary, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies those recommendations will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration. The Committee on the Judiciary will immediately be faced with the task of evaluating and analyzing the recommendations which have occupied the attention of the Attorney General's 60-man committee for almost 2 years. Because of the necessity of reconciling conflicting points of view, extensive and lengthy hearings on these recommendations are contemplated.

Mr. President, I concede that it will be necessary to have special help to make a study of the report, after it comes to the Judiciary Committee. But a subcommittee of this character was suggested several years ago, and was never created, and no money was ever given for it, insofar as the record shows, or insofar as I have been able to ascertain.

All I am requesting is that the resolution remain on the calendar; and as soon as the Attorney General files his report, we shall be able to determine—better than we can now—how much money will be necessary and how many persons may be required to make the study.

If this resolution is agreed to today there is no doubt that the chairman of the committee will appoint the necessary personnel without further ado.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The record should be corrected. It is slightly misleading. The report was dated February 21. It stated that within the next month—which would be March—the recommendations would be published. Since that time the Attorney General has talked with the Senator from West Virginia, urging that we get to work as rapidly as possible. I am now officially informed that the report will be released, even to the press, on the 31st day of this month.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could we not wait 2 weeks, until we get the report and determine what is to be done? According to the budget proposed on page 3 of the report, a quarter of a million dollars is

asked. There will be a general counsel, 2 assistant counsels, 3 attorneys, 5 attorney-investigators, and so forth. In all there will be 11 attorneys, according to the budget which is presented.

Then, in accordance with the practice followed in connection with similar budgets, there must be editorial, economic, and statistical forces. There must be an editorial director and an assistant editorial director, an economist, and so forth. Why not wait until the report is made, so that we can determine the amount of work necessary to be done? A delay of 2 weeks certainly would do no harm. I am sure the Senate would then be in a better position to determine the amount of money necessary than it is at this time, in anticipation of the report being made, as the Senator indicates. It may be that the report will not be made on March 31. I do not know, but as soon as it is made, the Senate can take up the subject in the light of the work to be done, and act upon the report more intelligently. All I am asking is that action be postponed until such time as the report is filed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope there will be no delay in voting on the appropriation. Five hearings have been held up week after week and month after month. There has been interminable delay, because we have not had any money to complete the various investigations. I hope the resolution will be disposed of today, and that the appropriation requested will be approved.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that Calendar No. 53, Senate Resolution 61, which is the pending business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 55, Senate Resolution 63, to which I understand there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, am I to understand that we are to pass over the antimonopoly resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Only temporarily.

Mr. LANGER. Will it be taken up again this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 63), providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after "Judiciary" to strike out "under S. Res. 245 of the 82d Congress"; and in line 10, after "Judiciary," to insert "or any subcommittee thereof," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified

by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$58,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] care to make any comments on Senate Resolution 63?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions with regard to this resolution.

As I understand, this committee was created during the 82d Congress. Is this the resolution relating to the Trading With the Enemy Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that a report was made last year containing a résumé of all the hearings which had been previously held, and that certain recommendations were made to the Congress. I understand that pursuant to those recommendations a bill was introduced during the previous session of Congress, but because of the lateness of its introduction it was not considered. I understand that a similar bill was introduced during the present Congress.

The question I wish to ask is this: Since the subcommittee has made its studies and has indicated what should be done, and since those in charge of this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee have introduced a bill to carry out the recommendations of the committee, what is the necessity for further hearings?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the Senator from Louisiana by saying that he has referred to only one bill which was introduced in connection with the Trading With the Enemy Act. I hold in my hand copies of many bills which have been introduced. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that there is a problem involving between half a billion and a billion dollars' worth of property which is tied up in one way or another. There are involved also copyrights and patents and a great many other things, which take a great deal of time and study.

I see on the floor of the Senate the former chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He will verify the statement that there is a great deal of work involved. I am a little doubtful that the small amount we are requesting will be sufficient. When I went before the full committee, it interrogated me as to whether the small amount would be sufficient with which

to do the work that is necessary to be done in connection with this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to respond to my distinguished friend from Louisiana. As the former chairman of the subcommittee, I should like to say that the Senator from Louisiana is exactly correct. An omnibus bill was introduced as a result of the efforts of that subcommittee. I may say that a rather substantial amount of money, which was not expended by the subcommittee, was returned to the Treasury, because the subcommittee operated on a very frugal basis.

Since that time, an entirely new factor has come into the picture. Within the past 30 days a delegation of personal emissaries of Chancellor Adenauer arrived at the State Department. Conversations were held in the State Department. A release was issued by the State Department, in which it was indicated that a wholly different type of bill would be introduced. In the bill the cutoff of restitution will be \$10,000 for each individual private claim, and \$10,000 for each individual private claim in excess of that amount.

That brings into focus an entirely new factor; first, the amount of money that will be involved and, second, how it will be financed, whether by reparations from one side to the other. There is, after all, a very tricky budget problem which presents itself. Therefore, that is an entirely new development which has come about within the past 30 days.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the report is erroneous when it states that based on recommendations previously made by the committee which was created last year, during the 83d Congress, a bill was introduced in order to carry out the recommendations made by the committee. That is the same bill that was introduced verbatim this year. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that something has developed since that time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And am I correct in my understanding that that requires more hearings?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I should like to explain the matter a little further. The subcommittee proceeded on the theory that complete restitution should be made, on the ground that we ought to revert to the so-called custodial principle in connection with alien property, rather than confiscation, which was written into the act in 1942. On that principle the subcommittee proceeded and introduced an omnibus bill. It envisioned, of course, complete restitution of the property. Since that time a release from the State Department indicated that the Department did not intend to go that far, and that it would prefer to work out the problem on the basis of limited restitution. That caused the development of some new facets.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder why that was not known before. Why was it not brought up before when the committee was created last year or the year before?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The suggestion was made, but no formal action was pro-

posed to the committee at the time. Speaking as the former chairman, I still feel the subcommittee was correct in going back to the custodial principle, because that has been the policy of this Government from the time of the founding of the Republic to 1942. However, other agencies of Government take a different view. I was not a party to the conferences at the State Department. I was not a party to whatever messages were sent to Chancellor Adenauer in Germany. Germany is the principal country in interest at the present time.

An additional problem, therefore, has developed.

Inasmuch as millions of dollars are involved, certainly \$58,000 is a very modest sum for prospecting the matter in order to determine what can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 63), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 56, Senate Resolution 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 64) extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Judiciary", to strike out "under Senate Resolution 326 of the Eighty-second Congress"; and in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Emigration of Refugees and Escapees" and insert in lieu thereof: "Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems

advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$36,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 64), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 57, Senate Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 65) to authorize an investigation of national penitentiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "or", to strike out "the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries" and insert "any subcommittee thereof", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to national penitentiaries, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$13,600, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year the Judiciary Committee received \$5,000, and this year the committee is asking for \$13,600. What has been done by this committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the committee is asking for a total of \$8,600. There is on hand a balance of \$3,600. That amount, with the \$5,000 now requested, makes a total of \$8,600, instead of \$13,600 as the Senator suggests.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution, on page 2, in section 2, states:

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$13,600, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We are asking for an additional \$5,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator wish to amend the resolution to that effect? The resolution requests more than \$13,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would make it \$8,672.79.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by substituting for "\$13,600" the figures "\$8,672.79."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, first, on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 65), as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 58, Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 66) to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask that a statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Senate Resolution 66, which provides \$102,000 additional funds to the Committee on the Judiciary for an 11-month period beginning March 1, 1955, is needed to maintain the standing Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. The subcommittee has been maintained exclusively by funds provided by special resolutions since the 2d session of the 81st Congress.

Since the beginning of the 80th Congress, which was the first Congress operating under the Legislative Reorganization Act, there has been a substantial and ever-increasing workload on the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee.

The number of private immigration and naturalization bills referred by the Senate has progressively increased from 58 in the 78th Congress to 1,958 in the 83d Congress.

Of the 1,958 private immigration and naturalization bills which were referred to the subcommittee during the 83d Congress, 1,694 were disposed of, 1,001 of which number were reported favorably to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee and 693 were indefinitely postponed. The remaining 264 includes 64 bills recommended for approval by the subcommittee and 20 recommended for indefinite postponement, which bills were not acted on by the full Judiciary Committee prior to adjournment.

Many private bills are indefinitely postponed because the committee has a general policy of disapproving private bills in cases in which an administrative remedy appears to be available. In this type of case the staff assists the Senator's office in working out the administrative remedy for the alien involved.

There were referred to the subcommittee 29 general immigration and naturalization bills during the 83d Congress; 18 of these bills were disposed of, 9 of which number were reported favorably to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee and 9 were indefinitely postponed. At the time the Congress adjourned, there remained 11 general immigration and naturalization bills pending before the subcommittee.

The new Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414) became effective on December 24, 1952; and in order to assure fair and effective interpretation and administration of the new act, considerable work hours of the staff have been and will be utilized in conference with administrative enforcement officials of the executive branch, in research, and in the study of rules and regulations and administrative interpretations.

It is necessary for the subcommittee staff to maintain continuous liaison with the various branches of the executive departments concerned with the administration of the immigration and nationality laws and it is expected that numerous, informal sessions and conferences will be held, as in the past, between members of the staff and officials of the Visa Office and the Passport Office of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Board of Immigration Appeals concerning administrative problems in the enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act and other immigration and nationality laws. Members of the staff of the subcommittee consult daily with other senatorial staff members in connection with problems arising under the act.

It is also anticipated that the workload of the subcommittee in this respect will be increased considerably during the current session of the Congress in view of the widespread interest in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the contemplated proposals to revise the act. Proposed revisions of the act have already been introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives, and any consideration by the subcommittee of these measures, or any contemplated proposals yet to be introduced, will result in increased demands for liaison and consultation with officials of the Visa Office and Passport Office of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the United States Public Health Service, the Board of Immigration Appeals and other interested branches of the Executive Department. The subcommittee staff will also be required to devote considerable time to consultations with representatives of voluntary

agencies interested in immigration and nationality problems, members of industry affected by immigration and by interested members of the public.

The staff of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee also provides service to the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, established pursuant to section 401 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

On August 7, 1953, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, (Public Law 203, 83d Cong.) became effective. That act provides for the admission or the adjustment of status of 214,000 refugees and orphans over a period of approximately 3 years. Considerable work hours of the staff have been and will continue to be utilized in connection with the administration of the act. In addition, it is anticipated that a substantial amount of time will be devoted by the staff of the subcommittee to a consideration of proposed revisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

In addition, the subcommittee has an extensive workload of referral items from Senators' offices and correspondence which cannot be statistically appraised but which necessitates considerable work by the staff.

The subcommittee also has a considerable workload of cases involving the adjustment of status of aliens in this country. Under the immigration laws the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of certain deportable aliens to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence through the procedure of suspension of deportation, but such adjustment of status is subject to affirmative congressional approval in certain categories of cases.

In addition, under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, a number of persons who have gained admission into the United States on a temporary basis are eligible to have their status adjusted to permanent residence. Each of these cases is subject to affirmative congressional approval by action similar to the action taken in certain of the suspension of deportation cases.

At the beginning of the 83d Congress there were pending in the committee 4,092 cases involving the adjustment of the status of deportable aliens under the suspension of deportation procedure. To that number of pending cases were added 7,855 additional cases which were submitted during the 83d Congress, making a total of 11,947 cases. Of the total number of cases pending before the subcommittee in the 83d Congress, 9,949 were approved, 129 were withdrawn by the Attorney General and 1,347 cases expired, leaving 522 cases "in process" at the time of adjournment of the Congress.

At the beginning of the 83d Congress there were pending in the subcommittee 876 cases involving applications for adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. To that number were added 2,507 additional cases, making a total of 3,383 cases.

Of the total number of cases referred, 2,697 were approved; 9 were withdrawn by the Attorney General; 195 were not approved; 8 were held for further information; and 474 have not yet been considered.

The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, became effective on August 7, 1953, and to date there have been referred to the subcommittee only 36 cases involving applications for adjustment of status under section 6 of the act. However, it is anticipated that the volume of such cases referred to the subcommittee will increase substantially during the current session of the Congress.

The present subcommittee staff consists of 6 staff members and 4 stenographers. As previously pointed out, the instant resolution provides for a sum of \$102,000 to operate the subcommittee during the current

period as compared to the sum of \$87,000 provided during the last session of the Congress. The requested increase in the funds to operate the subcommittee during the current period, as compared to the authorized funds in the last session of the Congress, is based upon an anticipated increase in the volume of work necessitating additional professional, administrative and clerical services. It is contemplated that a consideration of proposed revisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act will result in extensive investigations and hearings, thereby substantially increasing the workload of the subcommittee. Such activity by the subcommittee will necessarily result in increased demands for liaison and consultation with officials of the Visa Office and Passport Office of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Board of Immigration Appeals, the United States Public Health Service and other interested branches of the Executive Department, in addition to the normal activities of the subcommittee staff. It may also be anticipated that conferences with private organizations, individuals, and industry interested in revisions of the act will impose additional demands upon the subcommittee staff. Any consideration of proposals to revise the Immigration and Nationality Act will require an increase in the emphasis on the research functions of the subcommittee staff with the necessary staffing for that purpose. In addition, the increasing number of private immigration bills referred to the subcommittee, with requests for hearings in connection therewith in many cases, has contributed to the increase in the volume of work performed.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe that the funds provided by Senate Resolution 66, as reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, are amply justified and represent the bare minimum required to operate properly the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization for the period covered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand the amount being asked for is to carry on the work of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee. As I understand, the committee is charged with the duty of investigating all the bills on that subject which are introduced in the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. That is a part of the committee's duty. We have to pass also on all the deferrals of deportation. This year the Bureau has asked us to make a further study of immigration laws to see if we cannot eliminate some of this work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I noticed that during the last session of the Congress the amount requested was much smaller.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee is now asking for \$102,000.

Mr. KILGORE. In 1953 the amount was \$97,000. Last year it was \$87,000. Last year Congress adjourned a little sooner than had been anticipated, and naturally the amount of work was cut down, but we have a backlog at this time which was piled up during the interim.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the committee really need \$102,000?

Mr. KILGORE. We cannot function without it. If any money can be saved, I can assure the Senator from Louisiana that it will be saved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, insofar as they relate to immigration and naturalization, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending on January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$102,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

STUDY OF NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 59, Senate Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 67) to authorize a study of the narcotics problem in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a resolution for the creation of a brand new subcommittee.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. May I make a slight correction? The subcommittee was created to study improvements in the Criminal Code.

Mr. DANIEL. I interpreted the Senator's question as referring to a brand new job rather than to a new committee. I was in error in saying that it is a new committee. It is a new job which is given to the committee which was created to study improvements in the criminal code.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was the former subcommittee sustained? Did it work from regular funds made available to it?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. This is a new assignment to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. This means that in addition to certain professionals, the subcommittee will require the services of six professionals aside from those the committee now has. Will this entail the services of other professionals than the ones the committee is now using?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. This will entail the employment of 1 general counsel, 1 investigator, and 1 clerical assistant to carry on the work of a complete investigation of the narcotics problem in the United States. I doubt if any investigation of a problem so large and of legislation already introduced in connection with it can be conducted for less than the amount recommended.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning that fact, I will say to my good friend from Texas. I am only trying to find out why it is necessary to provide this money to carry on in the future the work which I understand has been carried on in the past by the regularly employed experts.

Mr. DANIEL. No, not this type of work. This is the first time that any committee of the Congress has been organized to go into the entire matter of the narcotics racket and to recodify the laws and recommend some new laws to strengthen our attack on this nefarious business.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent will these studies duplicate the studies which were made by the juvenile delinquency subcommittee?

Mr. DANIEL. To no extent whatever. We intend to use the evidence which has already been gathered by the juvenile delinquency subcommittee, the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee and other committees. We do not intend to duplicate the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the committee use the past studies in its work?

Mr. DANIEL. It will; but the studies already made cover only certain isolated phases of the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the narcotics problem in the United States, including ways and means of improving the Federal Criminal Code and other laws and enforcement procedures dealing with the possession, sale, and transportation of narcotics, marihuana, and similar drugs. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) the extent, cause, and effect of unlawful uses of narcotics and marihuana in the United States, (2) the adequacy, administration, operation, and enforcement of existing laws relating thereto, and (3) the additions and changes which should be made in the laws and enforcement procedures to prevent illicit possession, sale, transportation, and use of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and to combat the increasing narcotic addiction in the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for

such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 6. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 60, Senate Resolution 70.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 70) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand it, the resolution provides for a new committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. I wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that we do not wish to employ any extra technical or professional employees. As the Senator knows, the President of the United States has submitted a certain recommendation with reference to roads throughout the country. The President appointed a Commission to deal with that subject. Others have a different idea of the situation; and inasmuch as there is involved a recommendation for the possible expenditure of, say, \$20 billion worth of bond money within a period of 10 years, we thought the American people should know that the problems concerning roads in Louisiana, in the Senator's own State, for example, are entirely different from what the road problems are in Oregon, for instance, and in some of the other Western States.

I assure the Senator from Louisiana that I am with him in the position he takes. As a matter of fact, I am trying to get rid of some of the professionals on my committee. In many instances I think we have too many of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They do not vote for the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Texas, or the Senator from any other State; but they are always on the job with the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice, according to the budget submitted, that the spe-

cial subcommittee will be provided with three engineers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what it says. I am willing to let the Senate amend the resolution. It provides for so many technical personnel, so many lawyers, so many engineers. I am willing to have that provision stricken from the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not opposing the resolution; I am simply trying to get the facts, in order to make the record.

I notice that it is proposed to pay stenographers a base salary of \$3,720, and a gross salary of \$6,481.67. Does not the Senator from New Mexico believe that if that is to be done by the committee, it will be an invitation to other committees to pay similar salaries to stenographers? Frankly I think the amount is somewhat high.

Furthermore, will it not result in having stenographers who work for Senators and committees make requests for the same amount of money?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I disagree with my friend. I would rather pay a stenographer a good salary than use some of the so-called technical experts on the committees. I mean that. But, as a matter of fact, I want to agree with the Senator. The resolution was drawn as a technical proposition. Whatever may be done, let us not cut down on the pay of the stenographers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from New Mexico agree to the payment of a salary in an amount equal to that paid by other committees? The amount provided in the resolution is far in excess of what is paid by other committees.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator will do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only will we do that; but I assure the Senator that there will not be any so-called experts drawing pay for doing nothing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 53, Senate Resolution 61, authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion is agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the motion to consider the resolution had not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There seemed to be no objection. Is there objection now?

Mr. ELLENDER. The RECORD will show that the motion to take up Senate Resolution 61 was not agreed to, because I made the point of order, the moment it was called up and read, that it should be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to consider the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Senate Resolution 61 proposes a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the Federal antitrust laws. It should be noted that the basic law, the Sherman Act, is now 65 years old, the Clayton Act 41 years old, and the Robinson-Patman Act 19 years old. During this 65-year period, no attempt has yet been made by the Congress to survey the entire field of antitrust laws with a view toward a comprehensive revision and coordination of these basic laws. In past years controversy has arisen as to whether these basic policies may have become outdated. Because of the many differences of opinion about the objectives of these antitrust statutes, suggestions have been made by many sources that our antitrust policy be restudied.

Attorney General Brownell recognized the need for such a study on June 26, 1953, in announcing the appointment of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. The Attorney General's committee is expected to report its recommendations for revision of the antitrust laws to the Congress in the very near future. As the Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the "protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," those recommendations will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration. The Committee on the Judiciary will immediately be faced with the task of evaluating and analyzing the recommendations which have occupied the attention of the Attorney General's 60-man committee for almost 2 years. Because of the necessity of reconciling conflicting points of view, extensive and lengthy hearings on these recommendations are contemplated.

Questions have been raised in many quarters as to the adequacy of the present-day antitrust laws in the face of the apparent growth and concentration of economic power in fewer corporations and the consequent effect on the consumer dollar as contrasted with the situation existing at the time of the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890. In view of the fact that the United States Government is the largest single customer of business and industry, it has been suggested that a study be made of the adequacy of our antitrust structure with relationship to the Government's procurement program and its effect upon the small business of the country, and as to whether such large procurements are contributing to the growth of monopoly control, and a weakening of our free, competitive economy.

Questions have also been raised as to whether the legislative policies embodied in the antitrust laws, are intrinsically sound in approach, and whether the separate provisions of these statutes and their relationship to one another are sufficiently consistent and coordinated to effectuate a unified Federal policy of maintaining competition.

It is noted that there has been a concern in recent years by the Congress over the growth of mergers and a decided trend toward bigger business despite the amendment to Section 7 of the Clayton Act enacted by the Congress in 1950. This increase dictates a need for extensive study of the merger movement, its consequent effect on competition and whether such a trend indicates desirable or undesirable concentrations of economic power.

Criticism has been raised regarding the procedures and remedies of the antitrust laws. The overlapping of jurisdiction of Federal antitrust agencies, highlighted especially by the overlap in jurisdiction of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, has generated demands for Congressional action to centralize antitrust administration and enforcement in one source of authority, or at least to coordinate through a central agency the concurrent jurisdiction of the several Federal agencies.

These and many other questions that have been raised as to the adequacy and present effectiveness of the antitrust laws can only be answered by the investigation proposed in Senate Resolution 61.

In view of the tremendous technological progress of American industry since the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890, it is imperative that a thorough review be made of the entire antitrust field in order to achieve such realignment of the antitrust laws as will determine an effective Federal antitrust policy which can be enforced vigorously, effectively, and uniformly to achieve the desired goal of competition in a free economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 61.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I suggested a few moments ago, when this resolution first came up, I am certainly not opposed to a study of the antitrust laws. As was stated this afternoon by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Attorney General has appointed a committee of 60 persons in order to make a study of the antitrust laws, the same study, I am sure, which is now in contemplation. The report attached to the resolution states the purpose for the selection of that committee. What I was asking was that the resolution be retained on the calendar until

such time as the Attorney General's report may be filed.

Since the order for the quorum call was rescinded, I have been in conversation with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the resolution, reducing the amount which appears on page 2, line 22. I offer an amendment to strike the amount "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have action on the amendment, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 61), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand from the conversation I have had with the majority leader, it is understood that no one will be employed by this subcommittee until such time as a report comes from the Attorney General.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 62.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Has Senate Resolution 61 been agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It has been agreed to.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 62, Calendar No. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 62) to study juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Judiciary", to strike out "under Senate Resolution 89

of the 83d Congress"; on page 2, line 6, to strike out "Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency in the United States" and insert "Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof"; and in line 10, after the word "advisable", to insert "including no more than \$2,000 for obligations outstanding and incurred pursuant to Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable including no more than \$2,000 for obligations outstanding and incurred pursuant to Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$154,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have a statement, giving in some detail what the special subcommittee has done up to this point, and what the plans for the committee are in the future. I do not wish to read the statement at this time, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The Senate has before it today the Rules Committee's recommendation for an appropriation to extend the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. All of us, I am sure, remember the fine work the subcommittee did under the helm of the former Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Hendrickson). Seldom has a job captured the imagination and inspiration of a committee's members, and been more rewarding, than the job that we undertook 17 months ago. When the former Senator from New Jersey and I introduced identical resolutions calling for a senatorial investigation of juvenile delinquency, we had no pretensions about the job—we knew that it would be long, that it would be difficult, that it would be frustrating. We knew, or suspected, we would un-

cover some very ugly situations, situations that I, as a father, would wish did not exist. But we also knew that unless these situations were brought to the attention of the general public, the problem of juvenile delinquency would grow increasingly serious, something that our country, with its high ideals and morals, and its prominent place in the free world's showcase could not afford.

We on the subcommittee set an almost impossible task for ourselves. We divided the objectives of our work into three sections. First, we embarked on a factfinding mission. We wanted to determine the extent, the causes, the character, and the contributing factors to juvenile delinquency. We wanted to know how adequate existing treatment was and whether preventive measures were working. We wanted to know how effective Federal laws were, especially those laws relating to narcotics, the Youth Corrections Act, and treatment facilities of the Federal Government. Then we hoped to focus public attention, through our factfinding, upon the existing problems. Finally, we wanted to act upon the facts and recommendations we compiled. We wanted to help those youngsters who had already embarked upon delinquent or criminal careers or who had become addicted to narcotics.

To grasp the problem, we decided on a representative community approach. We went north to Boston, south to Miami, west to San Francisco. We went to the border town of El Paso, visited Indian reservations, and took a look in our own backyard, Washington, D. C. What we found wasn't pleasant to me either as a father or as a Member of Congress. Frankly, what I saw frightened me. I learned that as a parent, I could only partially keep my children from becoming delinquent, although this was an important part. Much of the remainder of the job had to be done by the schools, by the churches, and by the Government.

Here are a few of the things we learned.

We found a direct correlation between juvenile delinquency and narcotics. We found that young girls turned to prostitution to raise the \$20 to \$30 a day necessary to keep them in drugs. This week Narcotics Commissioner Anslinger confirmed one of our findings when he reported that racketeers are recruiting youngsters to peddle narcotics in ever-increasing numbers.

In New York we were told that there are an estimated 7,500 addicts in that city alone. Seventy-five hundred. In Los Angeles County, 8 to 9 percent of all children hauled into juvenile courts had contact with narcotics. In Denver it was found that from 80 to 90 percent of all Spanish-American boys brought into juvenile courts had contact with narcotics. And in Iowa, investigations revealed that 25 percent of the girls admitted to the State training school habitually used marihuana.

In California the narcotics problem couldn't be handled by local authorities. Across its border, in Tia Juana, every form of vice abounds, including widespread prostitution and wide-scale narcotics operations. Tens of thousands of youngsters from southern California pour over the border in search of this excitement. Local authorities are frustrated. They can't prohibit this traffic. To them, this is an international problem.

One border official told us he had no authority to arrest or detain any of the many minors returning to this country under the influence of narcotics.

On the basis of our study we were able to introduce legislation that would prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General. On another level, we proposed that the meager force of 260 men who compose the Bureau of Narcotics be increased to at least 500 men.

In further study of the juvenile drug problem, the subcommittee found widespread use of barbiturates, better known to teen-agers as "goof balls." These drugs act as a stimulant when taken with soft drinks or alcoholic beverages, causing the user to lose all inhibition and control. The drugs are not harmless as many people believe. Continued use will cause an addiction more severe than narcotic addiction and requiring lengthy treatment.

Manufacture of barbiturates in the United States far exceeds any possible normal use of the drug. This year the subcommittee hopes to get at the root of the problem, the solution of which may rest in Federal regulation of these drugs. We feel that there is a pressing need for control on the national level through the interstate commerce power or the taxing power of the Federal Government.

In one area, the subcommittee was both shocked and shamed. We found that a tremendous amount of pornographic literature, aimed at the young and sexually inquisitive person, was crossing State lines with almost complete immunity. A loophole in Federal law allows this \$300 million business to flourish next to the impotent Federal and local authority. Under the present law, this pornographic material cannot be shipped through the mails. But it can be easily and legally carried across State lines by automobile and truck. Federal legislation is now under preparation by the subcommittee to close the loophole in the law. Future investigations are planned to discover the extent of this disgusting attack upon juvenile morality.

In Chicago, the National Auto Theft Association told our subcommittee that from 1948 on the number of automobiles stolen by persons under 17 years of age has steadily risen. In 1952, 70 percent of all automobiles stolen, were stolen by boys and girls under 17 years of age. Such thefts involve a loss of millions of dollars to the automobile owners of the Nation.

Under the Dyer Act, children who joyride cars across State lines come under Federal jurisdiction. As a consequence our Federal Training Schools are filled with teen-agers who took an automobile with no intention of selling it, but merely to have a "good time." This conduct, of course, is inexcusable, but the subcommittee wants to look behind the law and see if the Dyer Act is perhaps too severe in dealing with these joy-riding youngsters.

Other crime statistics cannot be as easily explained. During 1952, 37 percent of all persons arrested for robberies were under 21 years of age. This age group accounted for almost half of all arrests made for larceny and even 35 percent of all arrests made for rape.

Back in 1948, we thought the problem of juvenile delinquency was solving itself. In that year less than 300,000 youngsters appeared before the courts. But, in 1949, with the cold war in full swing and the Korean war right around the corner, the juvenile delinquency rate started soaring again. By 1953, 435,000 children were being hauled up before the judges. In 1954, the figure jumped to over half a million. Only 10 percent of this increase can possibly be attributed to the enlarged juvenile population.

By 1960, this country will have a massive population in the 10- to 17-year-old age bracket. If juvenile delinquency continues to mount at the rate of the past 5 years, almost 800,000 boys and girls will be called before a judge each year. It must be remembered that there are at least three juvenile offenders brought to the attention of the police for every child actually brought before the juvenile courts. And that only represents the juveniles who are caught or turned in. Yet, even on the basis of the first figure, the problem is one of immense proportions.

The growing seriousness of juvenile delinquency is also underscored by the fact that an increasing number of younger boys and girls are committing serious offenses. During each successive year since 1948, a larger number of persons under 18 years of age have been involved in such offenses as burglaries, robberies, automobile thefts, and violent crimes.

As a result of the intensive community studies, the subcommittee introduced S. 728 which will provide Federal assistance and co-operation to States in strengthening and improving their programs for the control of juvenile delinquency. The bill also calls for the establishment in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of an office for children and youth. A prerequisite for Federal assistance is the organization of a committee by the State to coordinate all the interested agencies of the State in combating juvenile delinquency.

While the Federal Government insists on this coordination, as a prerequisite for assistance, no such program operates or is now contemplated on the Federal level. Each of the several agencies interested in the welfare of our young people goes its own pleasant way. Our subcommittee is now working on a program which we hope will bring together these various agencies so that they may effectively combat the problem of juvenile delinquency.

There are many and varied conditions contributing to juvenile delinquency which cannot be corrected on a community-to-community basis. There are interstate and national conditions and problems, and to these the subcommittee gave its particular attention.

The problem of runaway children fits into this category. No one had ever thoroughly investigated this problem before, although an estimated 200,000 youngsters stray from home each year. Our investigations revealed that runaway children are often committed to State or Federal institutions because of the lack of means to return them home. For their youthful action and the State's lack of funds, youngsters acquire a lifelong record as a delinquent. Further investigation by the subcommittee proved that the cost of institutional care of these runaways often exceeded the cost of sending them back home. Your subcommittee worked out proposals for effective interstate cooperation. One of these proposals would assist the States to return runaway children to their own communities in another State. The second would provide for an interstate compact for the return of runaways.

I have mentioned in passing only some of the subcommittee's findings. Let me pause for a moment and detail a few of our accomplishments.

Seldom a day passes without the newspapers carrying an account of some new action by a city or a State to combat juvenile delinquency. The very fact that the Senate of the United States singled out this problem for special study brought the problem to the attention of local and national groups. By the time the community hearings and their results were made national conservation topics, the cities and States had set up commissions and agencies to study the problems which we had highlighted. In short, the publicity accorded our work by the sympathetic press was a long step towards overcoming some of the difficulties inherent in the complex problem of juvenile delinquency.

During the hearings it was forcefully brought home to us, time and time again, that there is all too often a decided lack of cooperation and coordination among the agencies which are trying to do the job. And this, Mr. President, is true both nationally and in local communities.

The subcommittee has tried to do something about this lack of coordination. We have, first of all, focused public attention on this lack of coordination not only through

our public hearings but also through questionnaires soliciting advice on how better coordinated efforts can be brought about.

Some of the recent communications received by the subcommittee indicate that our efforts may be more effective than we had guessed. For example, we have had considerable testimony before our subcommittee concerning the need for the establishment by the Federal Government of a new organization which some of the witnesses called a National Institute of Juvenile Delinquency. Our subcommittee is giving earnest consideration to such a proposal. In order to get the best thinking on the subject, we sent out hundreds of questionnaires asking for specific recommendations on the subject—for pros and cons—on this proposal. Recently we received one reply from one city in which all the agencies had gathered together to discuss the questions we had raised. In compiling their answers they were led to see how their recommendations could be put into effect locally.

A few months ago, the subcommittee called together representatives of some 17 of the largest service, fraternal, and veterans organizations representing over 16 million persons. When these representatives gathered here in Washington we put our challenge squarely to them. We knew that these organizations were doing a lot to prevent juvenile delinquency. But we asked them to do more. And we asked them to coordinate their efforts in doing more. They accepted our challenge.

Just this month, here in Washington, these groups met and set up an organization to coordinate their efforts in combating juvenile delinquency. They were entirely realistic in setting up their organization. They fully realized the difficulties inherent in coordinating the work of many sovereign organizations. But they felt the problem severe enough to merit their attention and dynamic action. In this very quiet way, the subcommittee has gone to work on its task of doing something about the problems we uncovered. This new organization will long outlive this subcommittee. We have provided the stimulus, the rest is up to them. I am sure they will do a wonderful job.

At one point in our investigation we asked 18 leading national, public, and private organizations dedicated to the improvement of services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency to gather together. They all came. They met for a full day and gave us the benefit of their valuable advice and counsel on how national efforts of public and private agencies throughout the country could be harnessed together to pull in the same direction, to eliminate duplication, and to increase their effectiveness. Many of the valuable suggestions received from that group are incorporated in the subcommittee's recommendations for legislation and action. But one thing surprised me about that meeting. I was told that it was the very first time they had all gathered together. And they expressed the belief that even if nothing further came of that meeting the opportunity provided by the subcommittee for discussing their common problems, as they did that day, would prove invaluable.

We all know what happened when the subcommittee tackled the problem of crime and horror comic books. In a short time, by the publicity given our hearings and findings, one large manufacturer of the comic books dropped out of business. Then the industry set itself the task of cleaning up its own business. They appointed a czar to police the industry. The results of this action aren't clear yet, but their action, through the work of the subcommittee, is a step in the right direction. You will recall that several police chiefs had testified to us that many of the delinquents they arrested had learned their ideas on crime from these supposedly comic books.

When the Congress can obtain such immediate results on situations as bad as this one, then we can be proud. We have done the best that can be done: We have legislated without legislation and censored without censorship. To me this is the highest kind of order within a society, but one that is not often or easily obtained.

Here in the District of Columbia the subcommittee found a juvenile-court system that didn't measure up to the problem. The court and police took it upon themselves to clean up many of the faults revealed by the subcommittee's investigations. But, the subcommittee is prepared to introduce no less than six bills calling for specific readjustments to make the District Federal court system more responsive to the problems of juvenile delinquents.

The subcommittee hearings were largely responsible for an additional appropriation of \$75,000 to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This money will be used for juvenile services. The money was appropriated on the suggestion and recommendation of the subcommittee.

In Philadelphia our hearings were responsible for changes in the procedure for dealing with juveniles before the courts of that city.

In North Dakota, under the expert eye of the Senator from that State (Mr. LANGER), we discovered that the facilities of that State were denied Indian children residing on reservations. The Federal Government had relinquished its authority and no one had stepped forward into the vacuum.

During the four hearings of your subcommittee in North Dakota a number of specific recommendations for remedial action were proposed by various witnesses. Some of these were aimed at improving the administration of existing programs. Others highlighted the need for legislative action by both State and Federal Governments. Still others pointed at ways and means of improving coordination among the tribal, State, Federal and other agencies and organizations involved in Indian affairs. The subcommittee is now taking action on many of these suggestions and is presenting legislation directed at alleviating the severe juvenile delinquency problem in this area of direct Federal concern. In the coming year the subcommittee will travel to the southwest to see if we can discover the extent and the cure of the problem of juvenile delinquency in this Federal area.

The subcommittee felt that Federal assistance should be given foster children. Consequently, we have prepared legislation that would allow a foster parent to declare the foster child as a dependent for income tax purposes.

Each year tens of thousands of minor children are deprived of parental support because deserting fathers move out of State. To correct this ugly situation we prepared legislation to provide for the enforcement of family support legislation.

Let me for a moment recap what the subcommittee has already done.

We have focused national attention on the very serious problem of juvenile delinquency. We have discovered the weak links in the chain of juvenile delinquency rehabilitation. We have discovered some of the major causes of juvenile delinquency. We have brought these findings to the attention of both the layman and the professional in the field. We have provided Federal leadership for community projects. Communities all over the United States are now combating juvenile delinquency . . . and it isn't costing the Federal Government one cent for the majority of the work being done. We have brought together Federal, State and local groups, made our information

available to them, and, in turn, took information from them. We have laid an institutional framework by which to attack this problem and by which to receive and transmit findings.

Most of all, however, the subcommittee has developed leads for further study and investigation. The community hearings opened the door, provided the research necessary to attack the major problems topic by topic. That is what we hope to do. This is the area in which the Subcommittee can make its major contribution.

The subcommittee's efficient staff, in cooperation with the members of the subcommittee have synthesized all the information our investigations brought in and we have come up with no less than twenty specific topic areas that need intensive investigation and study.

The whole area of juvenile courts will come under our survey. Testimony before the subcommittee revealed that the Nation has only 7,000 probation officers while a minimum of 40,000 is needed.

The subcommittee will seek the cooperation of various bar associations and juvenile court judges in exploring the practices of the juvenile courts with an eye towards promulgating a uniform law and correcting abuses of the constitutional rights of juveniles and their parents.

Out of these hearings it is hoped will come some idea of how a juvenile court could be effectively run, the size of a staff relative to the cases handled, how much time the court should spend in social study of the youthful offender before the trial, the adequacy of the probation supervision, the availability of clinical services and the extent to which they are used and the professional qualifications of the judge and staff.

Much work still remains to be done with comics. Interesting leads have developed from our original studies in the field. One publisher testified that by mistake one of his trays of addressograph plates bearing the names of 400 children was routed to a publisher of sex literature. His mistake was one of many such mistakes by others. Advertisements of a salacious kind have been received by juveniles as young as 9 years of age.

The subcommittee held preliminary hearings to inquire into the extent, if any, that the presentation of crime and violence on television may contribute to the delinquent acts of children. Because of time limitations the subcommittee did not hear the full story of the effects of television on children. Further hearings are needed to determine if there is a casual relationship between the viewing of crime and violence on television and delinquency, and, if there is, what role should the Federal Communications Commission play in combating this. The television industry need not fear that we are singling them out for special investigation. We hope to conduct a similar study with regard to the movies.

The overcrowded conditions prevailing in our classrooms are well known. This national problem was illustrated repeatedly in the course of the subcommittee's hearings. The subcommittee found indications that the overcrowding and undermanning of schools are actually a contributing factor to juvenile delinquency. We wish to further investigate this matter and also deal with the manner in which schools may prevent delinquency and how schools may deal with delinquent behavior and vandalism behind their own walls.

Preliminary investigation into the relationship between lack of employment and juvenile delinquency leads your subcommittee to believe that there is a correlation between the two.

Your subcommittee must also thoroughly and systematically explore ways and means of providing suitable part-time work ex-

perience under proper supervision for the schoolchild who desires it. We must look into the expansion of guidance services and curriculum, including a schoolwork program in the public high schools, and look into the possibility of amending the Wagner-Peyser Act to authorize extension of the facilities of the United States Employment Service for young workers and to make its facilities available for the employment, counseling, and placement of high-school graduates and drop-outs, and to provide funds to enable the States to develop services along the same lines. From the proposed hearings it is hoped will come a detailed plan for a national program that will help solve this problem.

The policies of the armed services with regard to juvenile delinquents is an area wherein further investigation and exploration must be continued by this subcommittee. First, we must consider the problem created by the large number of juvenile delinquents who are not eligible for the draft due to their internment and, second, the problem of the many youngsters between 17 and 21 years of age who enter the military and suddenly come under an adult code of justice. For a minor offense, this youngster can be dishonorably discharged and his entire life ruined. We have no answers to these problems, but we do feel that they merit serious study.

Treatment services and facilities, including detention homes and aftercare services were found by the subcommittee to be one of the weakest links in the chain of juvenile delinquency rehabilitation.

We want to discover if our present Federal institutions offer proper treatment and rehabilitation of youngsters once they have embarked on a career of crime. We know that most criminal cases are repeats. If we can stop crime in its first stages, then we can go a long way toward eliminating one of the worst blights on our way of life.

Testimony before your subcommittee revealed that over 100,000 boys and girls are confined to common jails, thrown in with hardened criminals and not afforded the attention necessary to keep them on the right track once they have stepped off the main line. We want to explore the possibility of establishing Federal Forestry Camps on a cooperative basis with the States. We want to investigate the entire unexplored area of treatment and responsibility for seriously disturbed children. A segment of delinquents, while not psychotic, is so emotionally disturbed that special treatment facilities are required. Responsibility for such children is not clear. This hospital type of service is very expensive. Federal aid may be indicated or legislation may need enactment so that two or more States will be able to share the responsibility and the cost of a joint hospital.

Through its studies, the subcommittee found an unexplored area for investigation. This was the area of the youthful offender. A youthful offender is a person above the age jurisdiction of the juvenile court but still under 21 years of age. J. Edgar Hoover reported that crime in this age bracket jumped over 8 percent in 1954 alone. The subcommittee hopes to conduct hearings on the extent of involvement in crime of youths between 18 and 21 years of age and examine the court procedures in handling of these youths.

We also wish to follow leads uncovered in the community hearings that girls in this age bracket are being furnished for filthy entertainment and prostitution.

One of the main areas of concern of the subcommittee is the tremendous gap between the dollars needed for and the dollars allotted to family welfare work, education, psychiatric treatment and research, police court, probation and parole work. This problem will be with us a long time. One answer, to our way of thinking, is to get the best we can for the limited money we have. In most instances

those in the field are dedicated, if grossly underpaid, people. But, our preliminary investigation highlighted the lack of cooperation among these people and groups. In overcoming this we feel that the Federal Government should take the lead. Toward that end we hope to evaluate the programs of Federal agencies in the fields of employment, education, social service, law enforcement, courts, detention, and recreation. Also to be examined is the feasibility of extending the services of the United States Children's Bureau, the Mental Health Institute of the National Institutes of Health, the United States Office of Education, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and other agencies directly connected with this problem.

The illegal sale of 20,000 babies for adoption represents another interstate problem. Teen-aged mothers are particularly susceptible to the unscrupulous operators who market babies like dresses. In the Miami hearings it was brought out that Florida laws were inadequate to cope with the problem. It was revealed that a doctor operating out of New York was controlling the black market baby operations in Florida. Only when interested citizens contacted the New York authorities were the doctor's operations stopped and he called to account under New York laws. It is this type of situation that we are out to correct. The subcommittee hopes to explore this entire field from the criminal violations in adoption to the legitimate adoption and care of the babies of teen-aged unmarried mothers.

The statement has often been made that slums breed delinquency. That isn't always true, but in a growing number of cases it is true. At least, bad housing is a contributing factor towards delinquency. The subcommittee would investigate the adequacy of the Federal program in slum areas and the effect of slum areas on juvenile delinquency in such cities as Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and New York.

I have only outlined part of the subcommittee's contemplated work and exploration. But, from these, I am sure you can see the trend and the importance of continuing operations. Already findings, recommendations and legislation are helping to solve a major problem of our time.

When dealing with human personalities, one should not expect miracles or tremendous changes in short periods of time. We know that we are in for long hard days and ugly information. But we also know that we are engaged in correcting a situation that affects the very lifeblood of our Nation—our youth.

Many of us are tempted to think of juvenile delinquency in terms of children will be children. I only pray that this were the situation. But 17 months of investigation and study have shown us that unscrupulous adults and skillful manipulators in the mad search for an extra dollar are subverting our children. We have seen that the social ills of our society, and the tensions of a world halfway between war and peace are contributing to the restlessness of our youth and to the delinquency of some. We know that bad housing, bad schools and bad rehabilitation systems aid the growth of juvenile delinquency. But we also know that solid study, careful and realistic evaluations, publicity, cooperation and skillful legislation can solve this problem.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Members of the Senate that if the requested appropriation is approved, the subcommittee will be conducted with dignity; there will be a very serious effort made to determine the Government's responsibility in the field of juvenile delinquency, and the requested amount of money will go further and do more toward alleviating a very distressing situation existing in our country today than will any other amount

of money that may be appropriated by the Senate.

Mr. President, the fact that increasing numbers of young people are coming into conflict with police officials—in other words, juvenile delinquency—constitutes one of the serious problems facing the Nation today. The number of juvenile delinquencies has been increasing every year. The statistics show that under the Dyer Act, which the Federal Government has jurisdiction to enforce, 70 percent of the violations are committed by young people under the age of 17; that 37 percent of all persons arrested for robberies were under 21 years of age; that the same age group accounted for almost 50 percent of all arrests made for larceny. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover states that there has been an increase in rape cases of 110 percent since 1939, and the percentage of juveniles involved is becoming larger and larger.

Commissioner Anslinger, of the Narcotic Bureau, has considered the narcotics problem among youths to be of such consequence that he has assigned one of his top investigators to work with the subcommittee during its investigation. He recently stated at a congressional hearing that peddlers of narcotics were using more and more teen-agers to sell their narcotics, because stiff sentences have taken some of the old peddlers off the streets. There are many other efforts by organized crime and by peddlers in narcotics to use young people to perform their criminal actions.

The work of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency up to this point brought the commendation of all the organizations with which I have come in contact in connection with its work. We have received commendatory letters and statements from various organizations, including civic clubs that have been associated with the subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a list of those organizations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED IN LETTERS OF APPROVAL TO THE COMMITTEE

National Probation and Parole Association.
The Salvation Army.
National Council of Churches of Christ.
Chicago Police Department.
North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission.
Greater St. Louis Regional Women's Guild.
Utah Federation of Women's Clubs.
American Legion, Department of New Jersey.
American Federation of Labor.
National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys.
Young Women's Christian Association.
Whatcom County Farm Bureau, Lynden, Wash.
Holy Name Society, Gary, Ind.
Holy Name Society, Menominee, Wis.
Commissioner's Youth Council District of Columbia.
Crime Prevention Association of Philadelphia.
National League of American Pen Women.
Parker B. Francis of Puritan Compressed Gas Corp.
United Christian Youth Movement.
National Council of Catholic Men.
Board of Training Schools, Missouri.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think if nothing else had been done by the subcommittee other than to bring the two groups together the expenditure of the money would have been justified. For the first time in the history of this Nation all of the groups, of a voluntary nature, dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency have been brought together, such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Knights of Columbus, the Knights of Pythias, and other similar organizations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of the organizations which have coordinated in their work in the field of juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SERVICE, FRATERNAL, AND VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, FEBRUARY 24, 1955

American Legion.
American Veterans of World War II.
B'nai B'rith Youth Organization.
Fraternal Order of Eagles.
Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
United States Chamber of Commerce.
Knights of Columbus.
Knights of Pythias.
Lions International.
Loyal Order of Moose.
National Urban League.
Optomist International.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, 20 or more agencies, such as the American Bar Association, the Child Welfare League of America, the Children's Bureau, and the Office of Education, have been brought together to coordinate their work insofar as such national agencies are concerned. I ask unanimous consent that the list of those organizations be printed at this point in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGENCIES REPRESENTED AT MEETING OF NATIONAL AGENCIES, NOVEMBER 17, 1954

Administrative Office, United States Courts.
Advisory Committee for State and Local Action.
American Bar Association.
American Public Welfare Association.
Bureau of Prisons.
Child Welfare League of America.
Children's Bureau.
Community Chests and Councils of America.
Family Service Association of America.
National Association of Training Schools.
National Association of Juvenile Court Judges.
National Education Association.
National Institute of Mental Health.
National Probation and Parole Association.
National Social Welfare Assembly.
Office of Education.
Social Security Administration.
Youth Division, Federal Parole Board.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in trying to solve these problems, we have had considerable cooperation from Mrs.

Oveta Culp Hobby, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Her Department has been most helpful. I read now what she said recently about the work the committee has been doing:

In seeking, as you have, facts and opinions from many sources, you have helped the Nation, both to grasp the intricacies of this social sickness and to think constructively about methods that must be devised and used in dealing with it.

The public service you are rendering in this way is in my judgment of the highest order.

I do not know of any other peacetime problem of our society that is more important, nor which, as the President has said, is more "filled with heartbreak."

Furthermore, Mr. President, the President of the United States—for the first time, so far as I know, in any state of the Union message—has requested that special consideration be given this problem.

The committee has made headway in getting the publishers of horror and so-called "comic" books—of which approximately 25,000,000 have been published every month—to clean their own house; but there are still some problems in connection with that part of the publishing industry, including the question of how the matter is to be looked into, whether the cleanup is working, and whether such publishers have a tie-in with distributors, so that many of the newsstands have been forced to sell such publications for the reading of children.

We have made some investigation of the distribution of pornographic material—the slime which has reached the proportions of a business of from \$100 million to \$300 million. That is an outrageous business. We have under consideration a bill, which has just been reported to the Senate, which will plug a loophole in connection with dealings in material of that kind; and we think the bill will be of substantial help in correcting that situation. Other hearings are to be held in connection with it.

Mr. President, I do not know how much longer the Senate wishes me to discuss the 15 or 16 items which either have not yet been dealt with at all in the course of our investigations up to the present time, or have been dealt with only partially. They include such matters as the operation of the Youth Correction Act. It is shameful that in many States, youths are thrown into jail with hardened criminals. There is a great deal of interest in the Federal Youth Correction Act, but it is not operative everywhere.

We have not had an opportunity to investigate the facilities in connection with the treatment of narcotic addicts. We have not been able to make a study of some angles of the problem of the use of narcotics by youths.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator from Tennessee say that, in general, the resolution provides for a continuation of the study which was carried on by the former Senator from New Jersey, the distinguished Bob Hendrickson?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; the resolution provides for a continuation of that study. Senator Hendrickson did a great deal of good by the investigation he conducted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is my observation that in his studies in the District of Columbia, he was very helpful in exposing some situations which should have been exposed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree. Most of the hearings held up to this time have been held by Senator Hendrickson; and everywhere the hearings were held, a great deal of good was done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know that at a subsequent point on the calendar, there is listed Calendar No. 59, Senate Resolution 67, to authorize a study of the narcotics problem in the United States. Can the Senator from Tennessee tell us whether the study in connection with that resolution and the study in connection with the other resolution would involve any duplication of work?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that there will be no duplication. The study called for by Senate Resolution 67 is to be made from a different angle. Furthermore, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] relates to a recodification of all the narcotics laws.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have that point made clear for the RECORD; because if we were to judge from the titles of the resolutions, that question would naturally arise in one's mind. Certainly the resolution the Senator from Tennessee has been discussing should be agreed to. I agree with him that the entire field needs to be studied, particularly as regards the sale of some of the reading material to which he has alluded.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, we now have pending before the committee some 10 or 12 bills which have been introduced, to date, as a result of the committee's hearings. We have some 14 or 15 recommendations which have not yet been put into the form of legislative proposals, but will be put into that form in the very near future.

Several pending resolutions call for investigation of a very iniquitous situation; namely, the so-called trade or racket in the adoption of children. The committee has some information about that matter, which relates to the actual selling of babies. That has been condemned in many places.

Furthermore, the committee has a great deal of work to do in connection with problems relating to juvenile delinquency among Indians on the reservations. The committee has held some hearings, and much good has been done in that field. The other day the committee had a hearing on that problem, which is a very substantial one.

The committee has held hearings on a great many complaints about certain types of television programs. The committee has monitored some television programs, and has tried to work out the problem in conjunction with the Federal Communications Commission.

There is also the problem of employment opportunities for youths, particularly in the case of young persons who are out of high school but who, under some of the labor laws, cannot obtain employment. That is another matter that is being taken up by the committee.

The whole problem of the juvenile courts has not been investigated.

The committee has some investigations going on, Mr. President, in connection with a bill—which has been introduced—to make it possible to encourage foster homes for young people. There are a great many runaway children. The committee has made some investigations in connection with that problem, and wishes to make more, so as to determine what can be done in the case of runaway children, and how they can be returned to their homes.

Mr. President, I may say that as a result of the investigations conducted by the committee, or substantially as a result thereof, all over the United States committees have been formed; civic clubs have created interest in the necessity of taking action concerning juvenile delinquency; and various States have formed juvenile-delinquency study groups or committees. Not only that, but through our committee the Federal Government has been furnishing leadership and encouragement in connection with the attempt to deal in an adequate way with that problem. Approximately 35,000 copies of the committee's last interim report, entitled "The Comic Book and Juvenile Delinquency," have been sent out. I have before me at this time a copy of the report. The demand for additional copies of it has been tremendous, and has come from all over the Nation. As a result of the attention which, by means of the circulation of the committee's report, has been focused on the problem, parents all over the Nation have risen up in indignation and have demanded that the newsstands stop selling some of the so-called comic books.

I assure the Senate that this will be an unsensational, serious study. The plan is to ask the five members of the subcommittee each to hold hearings on some subject matter, either here or wherever they can be arranged. I am certain the Senator from Louisiana will be pleased with the work which we propose to do in connection with this problem, which he knows to be very serious.

A couple of days ago I received a letter from a young priest who has been working with children for a number of years, and has been one of our advisers and consultants. We have seen a great deal of him. His name is Father Daniel Egan, and he writes from Garrison, N. Y. The last paragraph of his letter reads as follows:

Again, God bless you with zeal and courage in the work you are doing. It is the most important work that faces the Senate today if America is to remain strong for the future. It is the biggest test you've ever faced. I pray that you face it and pass it successfully—for the good of America's youth.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in my opening statement this afternoon I pointed out that the original subcommittee to study juvenile delinquency was

created in 1953. At the time of its creation the Senate had the solemn promise of the Senator who originally headed the subcommittee that the money asked for would be sufficient to make a study of this question and that a report would be forthcoming, at or before the time stipulated in the resolution.

The time finally came for this subcommittee to obtain more money in order to carry on its work, in spite of the fact that Senator Hendrickson stated, when the committee was first organized, that the \$45,000 then appropriated to pay the expenses of the committee would be sufficient.

Later, as I pointed out last year, the Senator came back to the Senate and asked not for \$45,000, but \$175,000, in order to carry on the hearings. At that time, when the Senate resolution came up, there appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 21, 1954, an editorial entitled "So Now We Know." It reads as follows:

SO NOW WE KNOW

Having done relative little with the first \$45,000, the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee now asks for \$175,000 more.

The subcommittee started out to "paint a picture" of delinquency in the Nation. And to some extent it did. Now it is out to fill an entire art gallery.

It is not entirely the subcommittee's fault that the "preliminary" excursion into delinquency has proved so little worthwhile. Senator Hendrickson and Senator HENNINGSON have devoted much time and thought to the problem.

But delinquency is perhaps the most amorphous subject that Congress has ever tackled. Furthermore—and perhaps this is really the crux of the criticism—the staff work has been, to put it as gently as possible, highly inadequate.

The record, as now compiled, is a hodgepodge of testimony that adds up to confusion. Witnesses have been paraded to the stand without regard to the establishment of a comprehensive picture of any given phase of delinquency. Incidentally, the staffs of regular Senate committees set up hearings such as this one at a cost of a few dollars by making a few phone calls and sending out a couple of dozen telegrams.

For the sake of overburdened taxpayers, we are prepared to make a deal. Let's all admit that delinquency exists, that all of us—parents, police, courts, schools, and citizens in general—have their various responsibilities in correcting it, and if the committee will bow out with the \$45,000 it has already frittered away, The News will let bygones be bygones and refrain from saying, "We told you so!" which we did on November 17.

That, in essence, is about the same thing I stated to the subcommittee when it was first organized. I said that all that would result from this work would be a dramatization of child-delinquency problems. It is something that must be corrected, as I see it, in the homes and in the communities. Merely dramatizing the issue will not cure the evils.

As I pointed out this afternoon, the subcommittee made a report after spending \$45,000. Another report has been made after spending the additional sum of \$175,000 voted last year. That last report is now in the hands of the Senate. It contains recommendations of that subcommittee. I suggest that what the Judiciary Committee ought to do is to follow through with the recommenda-

tions made by the subcommittee, instead of continuing the subcommittee in existence merely for the purpose of dramatizing the issue.

I think this report indicates that practically every possible phase of juvenile delinquency has been looked into. Recommendations have been made in connection with each phase. The subcommittee has traveled to many of the large cities throughout the country, and on the basis of its investigations it found, of course, what everyone already knew existed. In addition, however, the subcommittee has suggested certain remedies. I say that now is the time to try to carry through the suggestions made, for us to act on the recommendations, and not to permit the subcommittee to merely continue to hold hearings and further dramatize the subject. Now, I say, is the time for action. We shall not begin eradicating the evils uncovered until we act—and the additional funds this resolution authorizes hold no promise of quick action; they portend only more dramatization.

I do not care to go into detail as to what happened to the subcommittee last year, but quite a disturbance was caused in the subcommittee when two of its staff members prepared a series of five articles which were published in the Saturday Evening Post.

Those employees received something like \$15,000 for their articles. I understand that the chairman of the committee did not like it very much, and my good friend from Tennessee resented the fact that these two lawyers published the articles and were paid for them, in advance of the time the committee's report was filed. Why the committee did not stop the publication of the articles, I do not know. The fact remains that the articles were published, and that the two employees, in addition to the salaries they received for their work on the committee, received a \$15,000 bonanza.

What is going to happen from here out? If the Senate gives the committee the \$154,000 now asked, it will mean that the subcommittee will go over the same ground that the Hendrickson subcommittee covered. I presume there will be a little more television and a little more radio to follow the committee around the country. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as all members of the subcommittee, will probably get quite a bit of advertising out of it.

And this problem needs no more advertising; it cries for immediate remedial action. If the amount herein requested were to be used in actually correcting some of the evils of juvenile delinquency, I would support it with all my strength. But these are not action funds, they are advertising funds.

In my humble judgment, the \$154,000 will result in pure waste. My suggestion is a simple one. I stated from the very beginning, as far back as 1952, that some good might come about by dramatizing the situation. I agreed to that. However, to continue to dramatize juvenile delinquency without doing something about it will mean that we will spend this money and end up where we started. That is why I am opposed to any more money being appropriated for this sub-

committee. I hope the Senate will agree with me. We have already appropriated for this committee over \$200,000. The amount of money that is now being asked for, \$154,000, will be just that much more money to go down the drain.

I hope the Senate will agree with me and vote down the resolution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the time the special committee was created, and I am entirely familiar with everything the committee did. I was also a member of the subcommittee. The Senator from Louisiana, apparently, would spend more money for the cure of hoof-and-mouth disease than is spent for the benefit of the children and the youth of this country. If the distinguished Senator had taken the trouble to read the report of the committee he would be asking that the appropriation be doubled, instead of saying he does not wish any appropriation at all to be made. Let him go among the Indians. Let him go, as Mrs. Langer and I did, to an Indian reservation and see the want, the starvation, and the lack of education. I can take my friend from Louisiana from State to State and show him children 16 years of age who cannot speak a word of English.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my friend; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The investigation as to Indians has already been made.

Mr. LANGER. I beg the Senator's pardon. It has not been made.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not read the report, then. He has accused me of not reading the report, but if he will read the report he will see that the study to which he refers has been made.

Mr. LANGER. A complete study has not been made. Of course, we made some study.

The Senator talks about dramatization. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and I went to South Dakota and North Dakota. We invited the Senators from South Dakota, and Representative Lovre, of South Dakota, and the Representatives from North Dakota. We arose at 6 o'clock in the morning. There was no radio or television. We went to Fort Yates, N. Dak., and called a meeting at 9 o'clock in the morning, which is 8 o'clock at Bismarck, N. Dak. We stayed there until 11 o'clock at night. As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will verify, we drove back to Bismarck, and arrived at 1 o'clock in the morning.

We went to another town and stayed all day at a hearing and returned to Bismarck at midnight. We left early in the morning for another hearing and

stayed all day, arriving at Bismarck again at 2 o'clock in the morning.

That is the dramatization this committee afforded to the investigation of Indian conditions.

What did we find, Mr. President? We found on those reservations no law enforcement at all. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] appeared with us before the Secretary of the Interior, and we have been having hearings this week endeavoring to get some kind of law enforcement into the four reservations in North Dakota and South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did not the committee also find from its investigations that some States have certain provisions in their constitutions which will have to be removed in order to pass appropriate laws dealing with the subject?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. The constitutions of Montana and North Dakota require a constitutional amendment before they can take over the matter of law enforcement in order to protect the youth. The constitution of South Dakota is somewhat different.

Mr. President, this appropriation, in my opinion, is not one-third large enough. So far as I am concerned, I would vote for three times the amount requested.

Go to the State of Texas, go to El Paso. I wonder if my distinguished friend from Louisiana has ever been in El Paso, Tex.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been all over the country.

Mr. LANGER. Then he is acquainted with a hundred solid blocks of land claimed by both the United States and Mexico at El Paso. For many years both nations have claimed that territory. The only line marking the boundary between the United States and Mexico is composed of a few fence posts containing two rusty strands of wire. In those 100 blocks of property, consisting, as I understand, of between 1,500 and 2,000 acres, there are shacks. The people occupying them cannot get title to the property; they are squatters. The mayor of Juarez and the mayor of El Paso say they are helpless to enforce the law. Talk to those who have taken children by the hundreds and organized basketball teams and bowling teams, and they will make it plain that money is urgently needed in order to do something about juvenile delinquency in the United States of America.

Mr. President, we went to the boys' reformatory in Englewood, near Denver, Colo. In that institution there were 250 boys of the average age of 17 years. Go there and talk to them the way we talked to them and find out whether there is need to do something about juvenile delinquency in this country.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana says he has been all over this country. Then he knows better than anyone else can possibly know how badly we need this appropriation to help the youth of America.

Mr. President, I simply wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to stay here all night and all day tomorrow in order to get this appropriation to give the children of the United States the same kind of a deal we have given cattle and hogs and sheep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senate appears to have been indulging in dilatory tactics for several hours. I am willing to stay as long as any other Senator; but I desire to have a statement of the objectives or of what is being sought to be accomplished. In the last few hours there have been numerous quorum calls, but in each case the order for the quorum call has been rescinded.

I wonder whether the Senate has adopted new rules. I should like to have either the majority leader or the minority leader tell the Senate what may be expected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the majority leader is dealing with 95 other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Idaho, he is unable to anticipate what is likely to occur. In fact, with respect to the observation just made by the Senator from Idaho, the majority leader will say that he is just as anxious to get home as is the Senator. But the Senate has a legislative measure pending before it. A difference of opinion exists, as the Senator from Idaho must have observed. An attempt is being made to reconcile the different viewpoints and to keep Senators in good humor.

At various intervals during the evening I shall be glad to explain to the Senator any other objectives that may have developed in the meantime.

As I understand, the Senator from Louisiana desires to offer an amendment. If the amendment shall be offered, and if it be the judgment of the Senate that it should be adopted, then I assume the Senate will proceed to vote on the resolution.

If the Senate agrees to the resolution, the Senator from Texas will propose that the Senate recess until next Tuesday. If the Senate is unable to agree to the resolution this evening, it will be my intention to move that the Senate return on Monday. The objective on Monday will be the same as the objective on Friday; namely, to agree to the resolution in such form as may please the majority of the Senate.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent re-

quest that the order for the quorum call be rescinded? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment to this resolution in just a moment, but I first want to remind the Senate that not 1 penny of the money which the pending measure contains will go toward actively eradicating the evil of juvenile delinquency. Not 1 red cent will be used to directly aid our children. On the contrary, the money contained in this bill will be used to pay salaries to a horde of professional investigators, lawyers, and clerks.

Reference has been made to the program directed at the eradication of the hoof-and-mouth disease. This program is not a costly one, Mr. President, but it is an action program. The funds involved go to actually stamp out the disease, not to merely investigate it, or dramatize it. I would be in full favor of increasing the money involved in the measure the Senate has before it if it were to be used to help our people actually and actively wipe out juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I offer amendments, as follows: On page 2, line 8, to strike out "January" and insert in lieu thereof "July"; on line 9, to strike out "1956" and insert in lieu thereof "1955"; on line 19, to strike out "\$154,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me see if I understand the Senator's proposal. On the basis of what he proposes, the report would be made on July 1, 1955, instead of February 1, 1956. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; on July 31, 1955. What I have in mind is to give the subcommittee, if it be necessary, time and funds sufficient to study further the report which has been made to the full committee and to carry through with the recommendations made by the subcommittee last year not to give the subcommittee funds with which to hold a new series of dramatic presentations and to again parade all over the country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to advise my colleagues, including the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, that I do not believe it will be possible, based on the schedule which has been planned, to hold all the hearings which the subcommittee has agreed to hold. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and I held a meeting in which this subject was discussed. It will not be possible within the time proposed by the Senator from Louisiana to hold all the hearings which have been scheduled.

Furthermore, it will be very difficult to hold hearings even on the basis of the reduced amount which has been asked for this year. Last year the committee asked for \$175,000; this year the amount was reduced to \$154,000.

Therefore, if the motion shall be agreed to, I think it should be known that, based on the schedule already

planned, it will be necessary to return to the Senate before July 31 and to ask for an extension to enable the subcommittee to finish the hearings, and also to ask for additional funds.

I do not desire that any Senator shall misconstrue the present intention of the committee. I am confident the people of the Nation want the investigations to be made and to have consideration of the legislative proposals. Therefore, the subcommittee would like to be able to carry out its schedule.

If the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana shall be agreed to, it will be the intention of the subcommittee to ask for additional funds before July 31, and also to seek a further extension of time in order to enable the subcommittee to complete its work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 62), as amended, was agreed to.

RESCISSION OF ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, earlier in the session today, an order was entered that when the Senate concluded its business today, it stand in recess until Monday next. I ask unanimous consent that that order be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement. Early this week, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and the various chairmen of committees interested, I announced that following action on the resolutions which have just been disposed of, I would move to proceed to the consideration of the cotton bill, which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Following completion of action on the cotton bill, it was intended to take up the postal pay bill; and following completion of action on the postal pay bill, it was planned to take up the classified pay bill.

I have had further conferences with members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also with the distinguished minority leader. Since it has been possible to conclude action on the resolutions tonight, I now propose to move that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until Tuesday, at which time I shall move to take up the cotton bill. It is planned to have the Senate proceed as expeditiously as possible with the consideration of that measure.

As soon as the cotton bill has been disposed of, I shall propose that the Senate continue with the schedule and take up

the postal pay bill and the classified pay bill.

Unless some emergency matters or controversial questions arise, that will be the order of business.

Mr. President, I have another announcement to make. When the Senate recesses, it will do so until Tuesday next, so there will not be a call of the calendar this coming Monday. However, I wish to serve notice on Senators, particularly the calendar committees of the majority and the minority, that a week from next Monday it is expected to have a call of the calendar from beginning to end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

AMENDMENT OF COTTON MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 50, H. R. 3952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, March 22, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Friday, March 18 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful and gracious God, may we accept this new day as a great and glorious gift; a chance and opportunity for heroic endeavor and noble service; a call and challenge to build a social order that has in it the virtues of love and good will

and the witness to a kinder and more magnanimous spirit.

We rejoice that, as we turn our thoughts toward Thee in the attitude of prayer, there comes into our hearts a sense of peace and power; the problems of life become less difficult to face and its burdens easier to bear.

Wilt Thou then constrain us to make a more fervent trial of the privilege of prayer and help us to believe that if we pray in ordinary days we will know how to pray with conquering power when the days of crisis and adversity come upon us.

Grant unto us an ever-enlarging vision of Thy greatness and goodness, for we humbly confess that we are frequently haunted by doubts and are tempted to become discouraged because the way is dim, the road is rough, and weather so stormy.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who is our refuge and strength. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5046) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 228), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act to lower from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder. I believe this bill to be an economic necessity for married, single, and widowed women.

Two hundred and twenty-one thousand and two hundred and forty-two American women between 46 and 64 have applied for jobs in State employment offices. The married woman under 65 does not have enough to get along on even if her husband is receiving his benefits. If she becomes a widow before reaching the age of 65, she receives a lump sum of \$255 from social security. The married and widowed woman is then put in the same position as the single women in this age bracket. She must seek employment.

Look at any want-ad section of any newspaper throughout the land. Very

few employers are interested in women over 50. Yes; they must seek employment, but the bulk of women over 50 find the doors closed.

Reducing the age to 60 at which women may become entitled to benefits will cost 1 percent of the payroll costs. Gentlemen, these are our American women—our mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters. Compared to the sums of moneys sent to help other women throughout the world, is 1 percent too much to ask?

According to the questionnaire I sent to the 17th Ohio District, which I so proudly represent, 68 percent of my constituents favor lowering the age so that women receive benefits at 60. I hope and pray that my esteemed colleagues from the other 47 States will agree with our belief.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is engaged in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER SOOY JEFFRIES

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, with the routine of this new session of Congress now established and work well under way on some of the most pressing matters, I should like to pay tribute to a former Member of Congress who passed away while the House was in recess on October 11, 1954. I speak of Walter Sooy Jeffries, who served as a Member of this body from 1939 to 1941 as the Representative of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey.

His untimely death 5 days before his 62d birthday anniversary occasioned genuine and heartfelt grief in his home community, in his native Atlantic County, where he was widely known and highly respected, throughout the State of New Jersey and through much of this Nation where he had innumerable friends among members of the Masonic Lodge and the Shrine, in which he had long been very active.

His loss will long be felt by all who knew him, for throughout his adult life he had contributed substantially to the civic and fraternal life of the entire area. For nearly a quarter of a century he had been in offices of public trust and had dispatched his many official duties capably and well. And in the Masonic

Lodge and the Shrine he loved so dearly, his passing leaves a void that will long be felt.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation and the world can ill afford to lose men of such outstanding qualities and integrity as were exemplified in Walter Jeffries throughout his lifetime. His life, so well lived, stands as an enduring monument to the memory of this outstanding citizen, who gave so largely of his time and talents for his fellow men.

He was born October 16, 1893, in Atlantic City, the son of Samuel Leeds Jeffries and Laura Jeffries. In his boyhood he roamed Absecon Island and spent long periods on the family's farm in Atlantic County. He spent long hours with the seafaring men of the day and early in life he learned to love south Jersey lore. Displaying qualities of leadership even in youth, he organized the Westside Cadets, an organization similar to the Boy Scouts, and for many years he sponsored the Jeffries Club and its baseball teams.

At 14 he finished public school and at 16 he entered his father's paint business, which he operated until his death under the firm name of Jeffries & Co. In 1912 he married Frances Sabbath, of Red Bank, N. J., and the couple had two children.

Throughout most of his lifetime he devoted much time and effort to the Ancient Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. He was coronated a 33d degree Mason, the highest honor in Masonry, at the 139th meeting of the supreme council of sovereign inspectors general for the northern Masonic jurisdiction in the United States when that group met in Boston in 1951.

He served 2 years as potentate of Crescent Temple and was a past president of the Mid-Atlantic Shrine Association, a member of Belcher Lodge, No. 180, F. and A. M., and Excelsior Consistory, Valley of Camden, Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite.

A lifetime Republican, he became a member of the Atlantic County Board of Freeholders and soon thereafter he was elected mayor of Margate. He served three terms as mayor of his home city and under his guidance his community survived the dark years of the depression and prospered.

In 1935 he was nominated by his party for the office of Atlantic County sheriff and was elected by a sweeping majority. During that period he played a leading role in organizing the Atlantic County League of Municipalities.

On January 3, 1939, he took his seat in the 76th Congress of the United States and became a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee. After serving one term, he returned to private life and devoted his efforts to his family, his business, and to his fraternal interests.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and the other Members of the House join with me in this tribute and share with all who knew him the deep sense of loss occasioned by his passing.

THE YALTA CONFERENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, since the State Department report on the Yalta Conference has been made public, there has been a wide variety of public reactions. Some think it was a good thing to do, some think it was untimely, and still others seem to think no good can come of that action.

The comments of an unidentified diplomat have, as I see it, put the finger on the central issue of the Yalta Conference. That diplomat is alleged to have said that since the United States had made these reports public, we would likely encounter greater difficulty in conducting our foreign affairs because representatives of other nations would be hesitant to engage in secret conferences with us for fear of what they might read in the papers 10 years later. The basic point is that we got ourselves into our present precarious position because we did take part in secret conferences, a practice contrary to our form of government and alien to the democratic processes. Secret conferences give a temporary protection to the participants to make agreements against which the people would rebel, and time to put them into effect without the consent of the people. That is the history of secret conferences between nations.

For my part I hope everyone will now be frightened of secret conferences and, being concerned about what the press might say about them in their lifetime, will put their trust in open covenants openly arrived at. Now is the time to put all the cards upon the table in any of our dealings with foreign nations and to require them to do likewise. We must recognize that there is morality and legality in the conduct of affairs between nations. That is the real lesson of Yalta.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H. R. 4951 and H. R. 4647.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] think would be required for general debate?

Mr. TABER. I should think we ought to be able to get through with 1 hour of general debate equally divided.

Mr. CANNON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4903, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, of course, is in the nature of an emergency bill to take care of deficiencies which have arisen for various reasons in the several departments of the Government, and which must be taken care of prior to the enactment of the annual appropriation bill.

Accordingly we have grouped the estimates and included the committee recommendation in a general deficiency bill, the pending bill.

Each chapter of the bill will be handled by the respective chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction.

The bill carries recommendations for appropriations totaling \$855,212,429. The committee has reduced the budget estimates of \$920,523,454 by a total of \$65,311,025.

The major dollar items in the bill are \$133,750,000 for the Department of Commerce, \$395,611,000 for the Veterans' Administration, and \$306,500,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These amounts, which total \$835,861,000 of the \$855,212,429 carried in the bill, are for such items as payments to air carriers, operating differential subsidies for maritime operators, Federal-aid highways, veterans' compensation and pensions, veterans' readjustment benefits, payments to school districts, assistance for school construction, and grants to States for public assistance. All of these, and several smaller items, are duly authorized grant or subsidy payments, or items of computed allowances over which the committee exercises limited control.

The bill includes a multitude of smaller items including, for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, \$2,570,000 to combat spruce budworm infestation, for several departments and agencies a total of \$1,880,000 for increases in costs resulting from various employee fringe-benefit laws enacted by the last Congress.

Several items requested are provided for in the bill by transfer, including \$1,452,500 for fringe benefits for other departments and agencies, \$224,000 for salaries and expenses of the Small Business Administration, \$12,320,000 for increased requirements for claims and retired pay in the Department of Defense,

and \$4 million for a United States contribution to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance.

Other items exceeding \$1 million in amount are \$1,068,267 for the payment of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry and \$2,824,820 for the legislative branch. This last item includes \$25,000 for preliminary studies and estimates for an additional House Office Building. Claims, audited claims, and judgments total \$6,269,842.

Language is included in the general provisions authorizing the use of presently appropriated funds for several departments and agencies for the provision of uniforms, or allowances for uniforms, as authorized by Public Law 763 of the 83d Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman or somebody on the committee address himself to an explanation of the \$4 million to the Foreign Operations Administration or contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance?

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad if the gentleman would reserve his question until the chapter carrying that item is reached in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the biggest part of this bill is for things that we have got to provide. There were some things estimated for which we did not need to provide; for instance, we found the Civil Aeronautics Board coming up with a request for \$15 million for funds and we found that a very large part of it was for the pan-American proposition and that they had not audited books on it; so they did not know how much was due to them. They finally decided to wait for an audit which to my mind is the proper procedure.

The Foreign Operations Administration has presented here a budget estimate of \$8 million for additional funds for this United Nations setup. Frankly, it is a duplication of the activities that are set up under the law through technical assistance, which is also under the foreign operations setup. They go into the same countries, they do almost the same things; and, frankly, I have never been able to understand why we should be participating in that operation. I think it is very bad. The committee, however, did recommend \$4 million in the nature of a transfer out of funds that are already appropriated. If they are going to have it, they might better have it as a transfer than the other way, because it does not make any more money available out of the Treasury. My own opinion is they ought not to have it at all, but if they have got to have it, it ought to be through a transfer rather than by a direct appropriation of funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 431 of the hearings, I may say to the Members of the House, will be found a statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] dealing with this situation. I recommend that all Members read it. It is a very fine statement expressing his opposition to this sort of thing and the necessity for ending this program. I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman so wishes I shall be pleased to yield to him to read it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This technical-assistance money that we have in this bill and have appropriated in the past, is that money that is used to send agricultural experts and technical assistance of that nature to every country in the world?

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not think they cover every country in the world, but they make a very considerable approach to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would it be fair to say that this money we are using to send agricultural experts and technicians to other parts of the world is to teach them to grow cotton and corn and other agricultural commodities which go on the world market in competition with ours?

Mr. TABER. It would not be fair to say that that was the only purpose of these funds that are used. I am only giving recollection now but there are probably \$150 million there under foreign operations that are to be used for that purpose. To give you an illustration—we developed this in the hearings—take Ecuador. They have 3, 4, or 5—I do not remember exactly how many—down there under the United Nations setup. We have in the direct operations of the Foreign Operations Administration something like 30 or 40. The question arises as to why there should be, if there is going to be anything of this kind, two setups that we are paying for. There is no use kidding ourselves, we are paying for what the United Nations does along that line.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is fair to say that with every succeeding year the opposition of the American people toward this kind of proposition is growing. It is not as popular as it once was. I hope the time is near when we can suspend sending our money abroad and keep some of it here at home.

Mr. TABER. I think that I ought to say right now that when we brought this bill to the House last year it did not have any money in for this setup. The bill went to the other body and that was loaded in. We found where they have violated the law. The hearing showed that they had violated the law, that they

had drawn money in spite of the limitations that had been put in the year before beyond all reason. Before we got through with the Senate we had to give them a little over \$9 million in order to get a settlement. That irked me, but we were in the last few days of the session and it was the best we could do to get a settlement and get cleaned up so the House could adjourn.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] raised the question of American technicians and experts being sent abroad to teach these people how to grow cotton and how to develop sheep that will produce wool and so forth. May I ask the gentleman, is it not a fact that we contribute 55 to 60 percent of the cost of the United Nations technical assistance program and although we contribute 55 to 60 percent of the dollar value of this program or the dollar contribution to it—we provide only approximately 14 percent of the so-called experts and technicians that are sent abroad. The British, who provide a million dollars plus for this program, contribute some 17 percent of the technicians and so-called experts that are sent abroad. In other words, it may be British experts paid with American dollars that are being sent to other countries to teach them or help them to produce cotton and other products in competition with American producers.

Mr. TABER. The Soviet is going to get into this program so that they will be able to send folks all over.

Mr. GROSS. But they will get in only on the basis of rubles, so-called soft currency, used in the satellite countries or in India.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid they will be used in places where we would rather not have them.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. In the hearings I asked this question:

It is my understanding that we have 84 nations in the world of nations and reading here it says:

"Technical assistance projects are currently operating in some 80 countries and territories with approximately 1,000 experts in the field."

I asked the Ambassador then:

Now, would it not be much easier to insert in the record the 4 nations not receiving the program rather than the 80 who are receiving it?

Ambassador Wadsworth answered:

That would be perfectly simple. We will do that, sir.

So, there are 3 or 4 territories in the 80, or I think you will find about 76 of the 84 receiving technical assistance.

Mr. TABER. Well, that is about the story.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made the observation that they violated the law.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state who violated the law?

Mr. TABER. The outfit that handled the money that went into the program, that was appropriated for this United Nations technical assistance. They drew out money and used it for one half of a fiscal year when that half was prohibited in the appropriation bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who is the head of that agency?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Stassen.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. The TWA has one trunkline which goes through my congressional district. I was very happy to note in reading some reports and testimony of the hearings on this bill that they have not received a subsidy in 1954 and 1955. Will the gentleman tell me whether that is correct?

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct, yes.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this brief allotment of time in order to clarify the record. Speaking as the author of the school impact legislation, Public Laws 815 and 874, when the new administration came in in January 1953, they decided to make some changes in Public Laws 815 and 874. One of those was to change the percentage absorption. I was a member of the committee in conference, and I refused to sign the conference report and I denounced the report here on the floor of the House and advised my colleagues of the House that it would not work. It did not work, so they came along a little bit later and passed Public Law 732. Now I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to page 22, payments to school districts under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There they are approving a supplemental appropriation of \$20 million; \$17 million of that \$20 million is necessary because they would not take the advice of someone who knew what he was talking about at the time. So, they finally got back to doing what was in the original legislation, and now you are putting up \$17 million additional because their proposition did not work. I just wanted to clarify the record to that extent. Three million dollars of this \$20 million goes to the Department for operating expense and \$17 million to adjust a mistake or misjudgment in toying with something that some folks did not know anything about.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express the gratitude and appreciation of the people of Oklahoma to this committee for their recognition of the very grave problem that

we have in the drought area and also in the Dust Bowl area, that is upon us, by making available this additional uncommitted \$7,147,000 to carry out emergency wind erosion control measures; and by elimination of the limitation of \$1.25 per acre which was carried in last year's bill which was an inadequate sum.

This is certainly a step in the right direction toward recognizing and meeting a very grave problem that is today affecting more than 26 million acres of our Nation's precious soil.

I want to express our appreciation to the committee and express also the hope that this step in the right direction will be followed by additional funds which are going to be necessary before the drought emergency is over.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wonder sometimes just how shortsighted we can be. I regret to see the attack on this portion of the foreign aid program that we carry on through the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there is no money that we spend that is of more benefit to the United States and to our national security and to the security of the free world than the money that we spend for technical assistance, which used to be known as the point 4 program. I am sure that we ought not to eliminate what we are doing in this field through the United Nations.

Russia did not go into this program and she has seen her mistake. Now she is going into the program. Why? Because she saw that she had made a mistake and that she ought to take part in the program for her own good. Now she is doing it. But you say that her rubles will be spent in the satellite countries. The Russian rubles will not be spent in any country that does not request that Russian experts or Russian technicians be sent. These Russian technicians will not be sent into India unless India requests that they be sent.

I hope we are not going to be so shortsighted as to fail to cooperate with the other free nations of the world in our attempt to win the cold war. That is especially true in Asia. We have not done so splendidly in Asia with our military forces. We tried to bluff our way through, saying that Dien Bien Phu could not fall and that if Indochina fell all Southeast Asia would be lost. We had to eat our words. We had to retrace our steps for our bluff was called by the Communists.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not envisioned that the rubles will be used to train a certain number of natives of India in Russia?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. That is in the hearings.

Mr. LANHAM. If India asks for that, yes. If India wants to train some of her people in Russia, why should she not do it? That is not the point. Russia sees that she made a mistake. So she is going into the program at the very moment that we are trying to cut our own throats and reduce our expenditures

in this one field where we may be able to block communistic expansion and infiltration. By our action today are we going to turn this program over to Russia and the Communists? We are apparently not going to stop the spread of communism by military action. As a matter of fact, this thing we call communism as an idea and an ideal cannot be fought with military weapons. How are we going to fight it if we do not do it in this way? What does our membership in the United Nations mean if we are not going to join other free countries in trying to fight this thing of communism as an idea and an ideal, which is sweeping the world like a false religion, which is what it is. How are we going to meet it except by this point 4 program, showing our unselfishness, our willingness to try to help people help themselves? That is what the people in Asia want to do today. They want self-determination, they want to help themselves. They do not want our money poured out over there. They want to know how they can help themselves. That is what we are trying to do through the United Nations and through this program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that we have four programs going at the same time in some countries?

Mr. LANHAM. That is true, but they do not overlap. I asked Mr. Wadsworth about that. I asked him if we could prevent any overlapping that does occur by turning FOA over to the State Department. Senator MANSFIELD and I made a trip through Europe 2 years ago and investigated the operation of FOA. It was not called that then. I have forgotten what the alphabetical name was at that time. But we saw that we were working at cross purposes in having this organization imposed upon the State Department. We found five men of ambassadorial rank in Paris alone. We recommended at that time that the operation be turned over to the State Department. I am glad that at last we are beginning to see that that is what ought to be done, but let us not be shortsighted and cut our own throats by refusing to make this small contribution to the United Nations' efforts to promote this point 4 program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee on approving the full amount of \$20 million requested for payments to school districts and the full amount of \$48,500,000 requested for assistance for school construction. I happen to have 1 of the 2 districts in the State of California that have been most affected by the increase in school population as a result of the existence of Federal installations and Federal housing areas. These particular appropriations are vital to the schools in these areas. They would not be able to carry through their programs with their existing budgets if these funds were not allocated. I am delighted the committee has approved them in full.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations I think I should point out to the committee that there are 74 nations contributing to the expanded United Nations technical assistance program. However, the United States is contributing 55 percent of the total amount.

There are 1,000 experts employed in the program, yet only 14 percent of the total number of experts are United States citizens.

Make no mistake about it, there are four similar programs going on at the same time. This was brought out in the hearings in the following testimony:

Mr. PASSMAN. In most of these countries you have both the United Nations technical assistance program and the United States technical assistance program as such, do you not?

Mr. PHILLIPS. In most cases both programs are in operation.

Mr. PASSMAN. How do you prevent overlapping when you have two similar programs going on in the same country?

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is a matter which has been of very great concern to us since the beginning of the two programs and a great deal of careful work has been done to prevent such duplication.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not fly false colors. I have been against this program since its inception. I have voted against the authorization and I have voted against the appropriation for 8 years because I have believed all the time that the program would continue spreading and there would be no stopping place. The program started with 18 nations, and now there are 61 nations in the overall mutual-security program receiving some type of aid. I believe there are 80 nations and territories participating in the so-called U. N. technical-assistance program. I must be completely honest with you and state my position and say that if I am called upon to conduct hearings, I shall be fair and impartial, but I am not going to be sympathetic to a program that I do not believe in. The public debt of our Government is \$62 billion greater than the combined public debts of all the other nations of the world put together. Make no mistake about it, that is the record. The majority of the House of Representatives has been working its will, and if it wants to continue giving away the American taxpayer's money, at least my position will have been made known. I think we should go into the entire foreign-aid program thoroughly before we get started on some new program that will make the old one look small. You are reading about this proposed program in the press every day.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly want to commend the gentleman for his statement. I should also like to ask him a question concerning an appropriation to send a certain number of delegates to San Francisco apparently to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the organization of

the United Nations. Did the gentleman's subcommittee deal with that?

Mr. PASSMAN. No, I am afraid the subcommittee did not deal with that subject.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to read into the RECORD a statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when witnesses were before the Committee on Appropriations asking for these funds. Mr. TABER, addressing himself to Ambassador Wadsworth, said this:

Mr. TABER. I don't know whether you know it, or not, but this whole program has been in bad odor with this committee for some little time. For instance, in 1954, when this bill was prepared, it provided an appropriation of \$8,500,000 to cover the entire fiscal year 1954. When the money was all put out by the 1st of July, we were very specific about that. This time we left it out entirely and the Senate put it in and we finally compromised and agreed on the item you have told us about. There never has been any evidence of any benefits. It has appeared all the way through that there was duplication all over the lot in connection with it.

Now, I don't know whether you care to comment on that situation or not, but I don't feel that I should allow you to go out of here without knowing that that situation exists.

Ambassador WADSWORTH. Well, I don't believe I would have too many specific comments on it, Mr. TABER.

I think the Members of the House will agree with me that Wadsworth's reply is an especially lame comment on the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York. Here we are called upon to provide another \$4 million for the United Nations technical assistance program, to which we contributed nearly \$14 million in 1954. We are called upon to give them another \$4 million when already the United States contribution is far and away the greatest of any country in the world. On top of that, it is my understanding, we appropriated \$105 million for technical assistance under the so-called Mutual Security Act.

In other words, our bill is apparently well above \$120 million for these technical assistance programs. It is time we called a halt. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] the other day took the floor and made quite a statement concerning the beating farmers out in Missouri are taking on their beef cattle prices. The situation is getting worse all the time. It is in the State of Iowa also. Our farmers have been marketing their choice hogs at the bankrupt price of a little better than \$15 per hundred. That is a loss of \$20 on choice hogs, over a year ago. In the State of Iowa we cannot continue to pay bills of this kind.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] made an excellent point when he said the debt of this country exceeds the combined debt of the world by \$62 billion. That is the Government debt alone.

I raised the question earlier about the expenditure to be made on certain emissaries who are scheduled to commemo-

rate the tenth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations at San Francisco. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee who handled that part of the appropriation bill could answer a question or two. I should like to know why, for instance, we are going to be called upon to spend somewhere between \$35,000 and \$200,000 to send some 30 or 35 emissaries to San Francisco, come this June. I would like to have somebody explain that to me.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRESTON. In the bill there is only \$75,000 for conference purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Then the request was for \$200,000?

Mr. PRESTON. That is right. The purpose of the meeting at San Francisco, of course, is a very debatable one. It is the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. To pay tribute to one of the architects of the United Nations, Alger Hiss?

Mr. PRESTON. Well, the gentleman has his own ideas about that. But it seems to be the general custom to celebrate anniversaries of organizations as well as of people. They desire to go back where the organization was created to have their anniversary. Of course, I would be the first to admit that this is a questionable matter, but when you think about the overall amount of money in the United Nations it is a mere drop in the bucket. So the House can work its will on this item. The committee approved it, recognizing the fact that it was one of those debatable things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. The appropriation is \$75,000, is that correct?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes. It is \$75,000 for three conferences; not just the United Nations alone, but for three conferences.

Mr. GROSS. What is it estimated it will cost to send these delegates to San Francisco?

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, I express a personal opinion that it will probably be \$25,000.

Mr. GROSS. I think they represented in the hearings that they needed a minimum of \$35,000.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, they could spend that much or \$50,000, depending on the number of people who are going.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. It is proposed to send 30 or 35 people out there. They wanted an appropriation, which will apparently be taken out of this, of about \$35,000. Can the gentleman tell me how they can possibly spend \$1,000 apiece in 1 week in San Francisco as delegates to that meeting?

Mr. PRESTON. I might explain that but I do not know that I should. It just depends on how much money we want to spend on this thing. I personally do not think I could spend \$1,000.

Mr. GROSS. What do they propose to do, take their wives out there?

Mr. PRESTON. Perhaps.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is about time we put brakes on this kind of spending.

There are several other items in this bill about which I wish to ask some questions later on, but I do hope we will be able to knock out the \$4 million for technical assistance; and the funds to send delegates out to San Francisco, and other items.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the Committee in giving me this time to make these few extemporaneous remarks. I would not have asked the opportunity to thus speak here at this particular hour if I did not think that there was a fundamental issue present and involved in our decision as to whether or not we would accept the report of our distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations and approve the appropriation of this \$4 million amount for the United Nations program of technical assistance to be derived by transfer from the appropriation heretofore contained in Public Law 778, 83d Congress.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, the fundamental issue I observe as present in my own conclusion in this matter, is that we must here determine whether or not we are going to continue to give evidence of our determination to longer cooperate with the other nations of the world who are likewise continuing to contribute of their money to this same fund. If a decision were today made to eliminate this \$4 million and thus to disapprove of the favorable action and recommendation of our Appropriations Committee, one clear-cut result of so doing will be to give notice, not only to the United Nations as an organization, but to all the nations of the world that we are appreciably lessening our desire to cooperate with the other nations through the United Nations organization. Our decision will, furthermore, be taken as a decision to make it less possible for the United Nations technical program, also sometimes known as point 4, to be as successful as it has heretofore admittedly been.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I accurately appraise the attitude of this great legislative body, when I appraise it as determined to not weaken the United Nations organization and to not give any evidence to the other nations of the world of any lack of desire on our part to do our fullest share in carrying out our previous commitments and our moral, as well as legal obligations, to this technical-assistance program which is one of our commitments to and through the United Nations organization.

I agree with the President of the United States, and with our United States representatives at the United Nations organization, which as I understand it is, that this money should be made available as recommended by our Appropriations Committee.

Another tangible and clear as crystal side of the fundamental issue which I said was present is whether or not we will continue to take a long-range view of the world issue in which we are in-

involved and recognize that military strength is not an enduring answer. Nor, Mr. Chairman, is it the less expensive method and manner of maintaining a position of mutual strength with other freedom-loving nations; nor of maintaining our own national security with utmost safety in this hectic world. I repeat that while I recognize it as no doubt true, at this time that we must be militarily so strong that any aggressor nation or combination of aggressor nations dare not attack us and our freedom-loving allies, nevertheless it appears to me as less than sound judgment to now weaken this technical aid program by lessening the extent to which we make it clear to the under-privileged and the hungry and the needy and the poorly fed and the ill equipped peoples, that we still are their real friends and that we have no desire to be militarily strong for the purpose of being a military dictator.

In those strategic areas of the world where the Communist aggressive conspiracy, is abroad and which undertakes to filtrate by subversion and aggression, it appears to me that we should let those peoples know in sincerity and truth that we are their real friends by reason of expanding money to help them get on their own feet in the matter of producing their own food supplies. And also to learn how to technically produce whatever they need. These are steps in the technical assistance program, and the point 4 program which are far more reaching in the hearts and minds and lives of these people than is the presence of a United States Army division in their midst. Both are necessary at this time.

Having traveled in a goodly portion of this old world officially as a member of the House Armed Services Committee these several years, I believe I have been habitually observing and vigilant in going out of my way to learn all I could about the effect and results of the technical-assistance program and also the program known as point 4. Yes, I know that the administration of such programs under the Democratic administration was criticized, and in some parts of the world I observed some administration procedures which I felt could be well subjected to sincere, constructive criticism. But I was also aware that there were present different and multifarious problems of administration which were not easy of solution, achievement, and correction. From the remarks made by some of you, my colleagues, on the minority side of the aisle very recently, I observe that you continue to criticize the administration of these same and similar programs since the last Presidential and congressional election as you did before that occasion. So, it would appear that problems of administration still continue to be present. But my information is that many of them have been mastered in the interest of efficiency and economy, and certainly the worthiness and need of the program should not be dissolved and destroyed and eliminated in favor of human error and mistakes. These mistakes and errors must increasingly be eradicated in favor of the necessity and soundness and commonsense qualities present in the

programs we are committed to. May I briefly repeat that I recognize that we must not allow ourselves as a nation with our other freedom-loving friends to become militarily so weak and defenseless that an aggressor nation or combination of aggressive, subversive nations will dare attack us. May I also repeat that while this sort of military strength against any who would capture us and make slaves of us, and destroy our freedoms, I also repeat and emphasize that corresponding with this military strength must be continued for a reasonable time yet this technical aid and point 4 sensibly and honestly and efficiently administered. The two must march side by side. These programs, therefore, are manifestly in the interest of our own national security and the preservation of our own freedoms and democratic processes. We must not allow any conditions to grow up whereby the Communist Soviet Union gets a further foothold on the hearts and minds and lives of peoples by reason of our own failure to do the reasonable, sensible thing, to demonstrate to these peoples that we are not at heart a military nation, but that we are a nation of strong desires and decisions that the freedom-loving peoples of the world shall not need to succumb to inducements by the Communist conspiracy. I do not consider this technical aid and point 4 program a giveaway program. Rather, Mr. Chairman, it is founded in the commonsense scriptural reference which says something about casting our bread upon the waters and it will return to us well but-tered.

In closing, may I say that I have observed in the printed volume of hearings before the subcommittee considering this bill, H. R. 4903, that for the calendar year 1955 some of the nations and the amounts contributed by them are as follows:

Argentina.....	\$300,000
Brazil.....	486,486
Canada.....	1,500,000
Denmark.....	550,166
France.....	1,448,571
India.....	400,000
Italy.....	200,000
Netherlands.....	660,000
Sweden.....	579,934
United Kingdom.....	2,240,000
U. S. S. R.....	1,000,000

And on page 421, the committee makes this statement, to wit:

The figure of 80 includes territories. Countries which contribute funds to the United Nations technical-assistance program but which do not receive technical assistance from the program are: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian S. S. R., Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Ireland, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukrainian S. S. R., United Kingdom, United States, U. S. S. R.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the committee for the item which appears on page 10 providing funds for a survey of the mass transportation problem in the Washington metropolitan area. However, I want to

take a few minutes to clear up what appears to me from the report on this item, on page 20, to be a misunderstanding.

In the report the original sum requested for this survey was \$400,000, which has been cut in half.

From the report apparently the reason given is "pending legislation affecting the scope and conduct of the survey could alter existing plans."

I should like to say for the record that there is no pending legislation affecting the scope and conduct of the survey which could alter the existing plans for a mass transportation study.

I had hoped that the committee would include in the legislation on this a provision which would have required the survey group to make a report and recommendation on or before January 4, 1956, on the advisability of and need for one agency to regulate mass transportation in the region. However, I think, due to a misunderstanding, we were not able to get that language in. I would like the record also to show that the National Capital Regional Planning Council, which is going to have the job of conducting this survey, has gone on record by resolution as favoring a report on or before January 3, 1956, on this question of mass transportation regulation by one regulatory body in the whole area.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, before I speak briefly on the subject I want to discuss, may I assure the gentleman from Iowa, my good friend [Mr. Gross], that if he will come out to California some time he will understand why 7 people or 35 people naturally want to go to San Francisco in June and to take their wives along with them. I am sure the gentleman would not want them to go out there without also visiting a most delightful part of California, namely, the southern part, and on the way out they might even stop in Iowa. I would like these people to see certain parts of the United States, if the gentleman from Iowa understands, which I do not think many of them have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would be delighted to see everyone who goes to California have a thousand dollars a week to spend while they are in California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If they have when they come, we would like them to leave some of it with us.

Mr. GROSS. At the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would like to have the people who go to these international meetings see some of the United States before they go.

Mr. Chairman, what I rose to talk about is this matter of the contribution of an additional \$4 million to the United Nations extended technical-assistance program, in addition to the more than \$9 million already appropriated, because I do not think the question before us is whether we are in favor of such a pro-

gram generally or opposed to such a program generally, but that there may be a complete understanding of what this program is and what it is not. I think there is confusion as to what it is.

This is not the technical-assistance program which this Nation created and carried on with great benefit in all parts of the world, creating friends wherever we did it, wherever operated upon a limited and economical basis. We called it the point 4 program. Later that program was enlarged. I have on three separate occasions put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the request of the advisers of the original point 4 program, resolutions asking us not to increase the appropriations for it, and pointing out the success when this is based purely upon an American principle of showing other people, from our store of technical knowledge, how to help themselves.

Within the past few months I arranged a meeting here in Washington of these men who have been close to the program. The program we are talking about today, which the United Nations calls a technical-assistance program, is not that program. This is a program to which the United States was committed, so I have been told, without authority to commit us.

This is a program under which, shall I say, certain people living in the ivory towers and windowed walls of the United Nations Building, would like to interest themselves in a program which is not our technical-assistance program.

There is involved, however, one outstanding organization that was created during my tenure in this Congress, and that is the Food and Agricultural Organization. As long as we can keep that independent, and free from such influences as are attempting to take it over; as long as we can keep that on a basis of specialists, technicians, helping people help themselves, we will have something the value of which in international relations could not possibly be calculated. This U. N. superorganization is trying to control the Food and Agricultural Organization. I have a note saying the U. N. wants to send a commission around the world to see if the work of FAO is being done properly; to see if the work is being done properly by a group which for the past 10 years has made an outstanding record in the food and nutrition problems of the whole world.

I think there are many people here who feel, looking at the bill and seeing the words "technical-assistance program," that this is money for the technical-assistance program, now called FOA and administered by Mr. Stassen. Although I have voted against the latter, as has the gentleman from Louisiana, in recent years, because it is no longer the original technical-assistance program of Dr. Bennette or other men who created it and developed it, inherently it is the program to which the money should be given.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I want to be sure I understand the gentleman. I think the

gentleman has made a very fine and clear explanation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I just finish my sentence by saying that the gentleman from Kansas was one of the men who first went to the meetings at Hot Springs and Atlantic City when the Food and Agricultural Organization was created, representing the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman's position, as I understand it—and I think I do—is that the appropriation of this particular amount will in no way assist in carrying out the original FAO program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I believe that to be correct.

Mr. HOPE. And the gentleman, as I am, is in favor of carrying out that program as it has been administered during the years, and perhaps even expanding it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. If that seems advisable.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, there are two items in this bill that seem to be somewhat controversial. Several Members have expressed the desire to ask some questions of the committee concerning these two items. They are the operating differential subsidy under the Maritime Board and the subsidy for air carriers.

The committee has made rather severe cuts in both of these areas. First in the maritime matter they reduced the request of \$60 million to \$35 million, a cut of \$25 million. Now, the feeling of the committee was that \$100 million a year was an adequate rate of payment to the subsidized shipping lines. The request of \$60 million would have brought the payments current up to the last quarter of the present fiscal year. The deferment of a payment of \$25 million, of course, operates to the disadvantage of the shipping companies because of the fact that they have to borrow money and pay interest on the loan. One line pointed out that they are indebted to the banks in the sum of \$14 million on which they are paying interest at the rate of 3½ percent. It is debatable whether we should appropriate the full amount or not, but the committee concluded that with our pressing fiscal situation we should defer payment of \$25 million until sometime during the next fiscal year.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Before leaving that point, the gentleman referred to the fact that one line had \$14 million on loan and was paying interest on it. Is that interest considered in setting the subsidy rate for the lines?

Mr. PRESTON. No; it is not. As a matter of fact, the item of interest cannot be considered by the Maritime Board in determining the operating cost of a shipping line. So it really amounts to an out-of-pocket payment by the shipping company due to the fact that we have deferred making the payment. I say it is debatable, it is really questionable whether we should do it, but, after all,

when you subsidize shipping companies to the tune of \$100 million a year, that is quite a fanciful figure, and we thought perhaps we would be in a better financial status next year to pick up the check for the \$25 million.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. May I inquire concerning the action of the committee with reference to providing subsidy payments for commercial air carriers?

Mr. PRESTON. I was just about to address myself to that subject. The request for the air carriers was \$15.2 million. The committee reduced that to the flat figure of \$5 million, a cut of \$10.2 million. There again the committee recognizes the fact that this is an obligation of the Federal Government that ultimately will have to be paid. But the presentation made by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the committee was so inadequate and the evidence revealed that the Civil Aeronautics Board had not put into effect the decision of the Supreme Court concerning the auditing of the companies and the auditing of the separate divisions; so that the purpose of the committee in reducing this was to say to the CAB that "Until you audit these companies properly we are not going to pay the bills."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, I yield further.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that the subsidy payment that is required would be affected but little by the decision referred to of the Supreme Court of the United States, because that affects the international carriers. It is my understanding that the greater portion of this subsidy is for the local carriers and I believe three trunkline carriers. Is that true?

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct. We stated in the report that the money appropriated we thought would be adequate to take care of the domestic carriers and the feeder lines. It was not the committee's purpose, as stated in the report, to spend any of this money for the international carriers but preferably for the domestic and feeder lines.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman's committee, I know, endeavored to get all the facts that it could get in order to meet this problem. Was the committee satisfied that \$5 million would be sufficient to take care of this responsibility for the rest of this fiscal year?

Mr. PRESTON. To be perfectly frank with the gentleman, I doubt that we are completely satisfied.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not anticipated that if additional information is obtained, at some subsequent time a more correct determination can be made?

Mr. PRESTON. On yesterday I had a lengthy conversation with the chairman of the CAB, and I assured him that when they were able to produce the facts for the committee we would certainly be bound by what the facts revealed, and we would make the funds available. If we have cut too far, we will have an opportunity between now and the time the matter is considered in the Senate

and the time the conference committee meets to correct that action, and the committee would want to do that.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is it not a fact that the committee, from the confused state of the testimony submitted to it, felt that the amount of \$5 million was adequate to carry the subsidy payments on through this fiscal year?

Mr. PRESTON. We thought so. Of course, we can be wrong, but we have ample time to find that out.

Mr. BOW. Is it not true that it is the intent to carry on the payments during the year? It was not the intent of the committee or the gentleman from Georgia who now has the floor, the chairman of the subcommittee, to cut off the payments?

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There was no motive in mind at all designed to stop the subsidy payments, because that is a statutory matter that the Congress has passed upon, and we are bound by it. It is a matter that is recoverable in the Court of Claims.

Mr. BOW. Is it not also a fact that the intent was to get proper audits and proper testimony before the committee so we would be able to proceed on the basis of fact rather than the fiction that has been coming up to us?

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Payments to air carriers

For an additional amount for "Payments to air carriers," \$5 million, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] tell me again, for I did not quite understand his remarks, the difference between the two technical-assistance programs and which he supports?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is contained on page 439 of the hearings, a copy of which the gentleman has in his hand. This shows money for the United Nations technical-assistance program. Then, in a separate item, it shows the money to support the Food and Agriculture Organization, and there are 3 or 4 other items, including a technical-assistance board.

There is also in operation through the FOA—not the FAO but the FOA, which is the agency headed by Mr. Stassen—a program that we call the point 4 program. Its actual name is the technical-assistance program, which you see is a duplication of name and duplication of activities.

There is going on, right at the present time, a study, activated, I think, out of the White House, of the best method of handling this program, of preventing

duplication and trying to recommend to the President what its future should be. My comments were that they should be very careful that the money appropriated to this United Nations fund—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the bill here before us?

Mr. PHILLIPS. This bill here—should not be confused with the money which we appropriate and have appropriated in the past to the other fund, which is one that has been carrying on, until it became a giveaway program, but even now as part of that, a very good program, very inexpensive, very simple, helping people to help themselves and creating friends for us all over the world, whereas the big giveaway programs, in the opinion of those that are closest to them, like the original council of advisers, is losing friends for us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps I am dumb, but does the gentleman approve that appropriation in this bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Had it been left exclusively to me, I should have removed the first item of \$4,653,408, and I should be very careful not to increase the money. This present money is actually being transferred to it from the money we appropriated previously for the other program, and is a supplemental amount to the \$9 million appropriated in the regular bill last year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was the other the giveaway one or is this one the giveaway one?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Both, I guess, is the answer on that first item.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repair of reserve-fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)

The limitation under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount which may be advanced to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, maritime activities," is increased from "\$150,000" to "\$225,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of Commerce, the gentleman from Georgia, a few questions about the funds for operating subsidies. As I understood the gentleman, the budget request for \$60 million, and the committee cut that down to \$35 million?

Mr. PRESTON. That is correct.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is my understanding also correct that the full \$60 million was requested after approval, of course, by the Maritime Administration?

Mr. PRESTON. That is true.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Was the full \$60 million approved by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. PRESTON. It was.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. So there can be no question but that the full \$60 million is a valid and just obligation on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. PRESTON. It must be admitted that that is true.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it the purpose of the committee then to leave the balance of the \$60 million, namely \$25 million due and owing, until the next fiscal year?

Mr. PRESTON. Of course, we cannot foresee the action of the other body. This is a matter which will go to conference. After that time, if there is still a deficiency, the Maritime Board can seek another supplemental appropriation.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. But insofar as the House committee is concerned, it would prefer to leave the matter go over until the next fiscal year?

Mr. PRESTON. I may have left that impression a moment ago when I was addressing the Committee. I would not say that is entirely correct. I do not know what the subcommittee would do about it on a supplemental appropriation bill, but I am inclined to believe if there is a remaining sum due, a supplemental request would be looked upon with favor. Of course, that is only my judgment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Washington, that in this appropriation bill and in all appropriation bills, dealing with the Maritime Administration there is language in the bill which specifically reiterates that the Maritime Administration has authority to commit the United States Government to long-term contracts by subsidies. Whether we like it or do not like it, as long as that language remains in the bill, and you recall the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee on several occasions has attempted to strike it from the bill—

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Indeed, I do remember.

Mr. THOMAS. As long as that language is in the bill, it is a valid debt and you are going to have to pay it. I would not be too surprised if you let it drag beyond the due date, you will find you will get a ruling from the General Accounting Office that perhaps you not only owe them money, but interest on it. It will have to be paid—make no mistake about it.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, this subsidy matter is one which we, perhaps, do not like, generally speaking, but under the terms of the 1936 act, which was approved by the Congress for good and sufficient reasons at that time, and I believe for good and sufficient reasons now, we do need to subsidize our American merchant marine. I justify it not only by reason of the economic benefits which ensue, but for reasons of our national defense. The gentleman from Georgia made a statement that \$100 million was a lot of money to spend in 1 year to subsidize maritime operators. You will understand that that money does not go to the operators in one sense of the word, but goes to pay for the differential in wage costs and repairing and maintenance and so forth between the costs in this Nation and costs abroad. So actually it does not go into anybody's pockets except the pockets of the workers; \$100 million does sound like a lot of money. I want to remind the House, however, that we are paying between

\$300 million and \$400 million in interest alone on a debt which was incurred in World War II for the construction of ships which we needed to carry out our war effort. We had so neglected our merchant marine that when World War II broke out we did not have cargo and passenger vessels in sufficient number to carry men and materials to the fighting fronts. So maybe this \$100 million a year investment in maintaining a going American merchant marine is a pretty good one in the interest of our national defense. While it is, or rather while it does seem to be, a lot of money, it is small when compared to other defense expenditures which we have to pay.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman is touching on a subject which really deserves some attention now when he talks about construction. How many ships have subsidized operators drawing this \$100 million a year built? I am talking about new ships since the close of World War II. There have been built less than 15 or 18 ships.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am sorry my time has expired, but it is a worthwhile subject to go into and I hope it can be gone into very thoroughly at some future time on the floor of the House. The operating subsidies have not averaged \$100 million per year. The average cost runs considerably less than that. Under the subsidy contracts the operators have agreed to replace their vessels as they approach obsolescence. I am sure they will do so unless Congress takes some action which will upset the plans. Let us not repeat the mistakes of the past and again neglect our merchant marine. If we do it will cost us a great deal more in the long run. And do not let us forget that we are talking about our fourth arm of defense without which all other arms of defense are not fully effective.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance

For an addition amount for "Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance," for United States contributions during the period ending June 30, 1955, \$4 million, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation contained in Public Law 778, 83d Congress, for assistance authorized by section 121 of Public Law 665, 83d Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order to make against this item on page 7.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman reserve the point of order for a moment?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, of course.

Mr. TABER. I just wanted to suggest to the gentleman that we might better vote on this thing as it stands as a direct appropriation, which would be in order, and if we should vote it out as a transfer, that would be the end of it. But if we throw this out on a point of order, the question would come up then whether we should take the money directly out

of the Treasury or out of funds already appropriated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The purpose of my amendment is to strike the entire chapter. As I understand it, the effect of the point of order being sustained would be to provide that this shall be an additional \$4 million rather than a transfer.

Mr. TABER. Whatever question we vote on would be whether we take the money directly out of the Treasury or not; whereas, if they vote on this question as it stands, it would be on whether or not we allowed the money to be transferred from one appropriation to another.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand the gentlemen's remarks, they are going to get the \$4 million anyway.

Mr. TABER. I do not say that. Frankly, I shall vote in favor of striking the thing out if a motion is made to strike it out. If it is thrown out on a point of order and the \$4 million is offered direct, I shall vote against that. That is my position, and I hope the House will feel the same way.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think it is bad legislation and a waste of money. If we cannot prevent it entirely, I would like to postpone that evil day as long as we can.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would the gentleman reserve his point of order until after the amendment has been read? I think we are both trying to attain the same end.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just want it out. I do not care whether it goes out at half past 1 or 2 o'clock. I make a point of order against that chapter.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill, because in line 19 it provides that the "\$4 million, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation contained in Public Law 778, 83d Congress, for assistance authorized by section 121 of Public Law 665, 83d Congress." That section which I have before me expressly provides that the money is given to the President for his own purposes. Down in the next section a limitation is put on the fund. The President's control over it is limited to certain specific purposes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Could the gentleman reserve his point of order until after the matter has been acted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the point of order will have to be disposed of before consideration of the item.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I do not make it now I cannot make it after it has been acted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make it now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PRESTON. I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry: To which lines on page 7 does the gentleman's point of order apply?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order lies against the whole chapter, as the Chair understands it.

Mr. PRESTON. There are, of course, two portions to the chapter. It is our position that the gentleman from Michigan cannot make his point of order against more than one paragraph of the chapter at a time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point of order lies against the provision on page 7: "Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance" at the bottom of the page, the paragraph in lines 16 to 22, inclusive.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRESTON: After line 11 on page 7, insert:

"Funds appropriated to the President, Mutual Security contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance; For an additional amount for 'Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance,' for United States contributions during the period ending June 30, 1955, \$4 million."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to explain the committee's position. When this matter came before the Subcommittee on Appropriations last year the committee did not recommend any funds for the United Nations expanded technical-assistance program. When the bill reached the floor, the House sustained the action of the subcommittee. The other body put in the bill a substantial sum for this program. The House conferees agreed to the action when the bill was in conference.

When the matter was brought before the subcommittee this year for a supplemental appropriation, we asked the Ambassador if he was familiar with the language in the appropriation bill of last year, which read as follows:

No commitment for the calendar year 1955 or thereafter shall be pledged on behalf of the United States until the Congress appropriates for said purpose.

Ambassador WADSWORTH. Yes, sir.

He understood it. I asked this question:

Up to this time there has been no commitment whatsoever with respect to supplemental appropriations?

Ambassador WADSWORTH. There has been none.

Your committee felt that on account of the action of the other body last year

and the agreement in conference the committee should recommend, and by majority did recommend, \$4 million, and that is the item that is before the committee at this time.

I might add that it was a compromise in the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; I should be happy to yield.

Mr. GROSS. This will be a direct appropriation out of the Treasury.

Mr. PASSMAN. This will be a direct appropriation out of the Treasury.

We thought, inasmuch as there were \$6,200,000,000 in the overall program unobligated, that somewhere FOA would be able to find the \$4 million. If a point of order had not been made and sustained by the Chair, the \$4 million would have been allocated out of the funds already appropriated, but inasmuch as the Chair sustained the point of order it is a question of whether or not you are going to vote a \$4 million new appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Therefore, it becomes an addition to the Federal debt?

Mr. PASSMAN. It becomes an addition to the Federal debt; yes; and a new appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman answer one other question? How much have we appropriated for United States technical assistance?

Mr. PASSMAN. For the current fiscal year we have appropriated \$105 million for the United States technical-assistance program.

Mr. GROSS. And for the United Nations? This goes to the United Nations?

Mr. PASSMAN. This goes to the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. How much for the United Nations technical assistance program for fiscal year 1955?

Mr. PASSMAN. \$9,957,621.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the figure was \$13,900,000 approximately. I assume that figure is the total of the \$9,957,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1955, plus the \$4 million in this supplemental bill.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman from Louisiana is correct. The figure is \$9,957,000.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say to the gentleman there are 74 nations that contribute. The United States has contributed up to this time 55 percent of the total.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. On page 439 of the hearings you have a list of the year 1954 breakdown for the United Nations expanded program for technical assistance. This comes to a total of \$19 million plus. All this supplementary \$4 million is for is to fill up a gap which apparently previous money did not reach. If the \$4 million were to be used for all of these 8 items that are shown in there, then there would be a very real question as to whether it were being used as the Congress has directed it to be used. If the amendment were to limit it exclusively to the Food and Agricultural Organization and nothing else, then the amendment might have merit. Would

the gentleman feel it possible to amend that motion to limit this \$4 million exclusively to the use of the Food and Agricultural Organization?

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say to the gentleman from California that this appropriation was to see the program through June 30, 1955. It was established in the hearings that \$2,200,000 would be sufficient to carry the program through June 30, 1955. The \$4 million was a compromise. If you will read the hearings, you will ascertain that \$2,200,000 will be sufficient to carry the program through June 30, 1955.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not quite understand the gentleman from Louisiana. Does he mean that we actually only need \$2½ million and are asking for \$4 million?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is absolutely correct. I believe the gentleman understands there was a compromise in the committee. The majority of the committee agreed to the \$4 million. The gentleman is correct. The hearings indicate that the \$2,200,000 will see the program through June 30 this year.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask for this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week. I know many Members want to know as quickly as possible as to what may be expected for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is Consent Calendar day. Of course, the calendar will not be called, because it was called last Tuesday out of order. Nevertheless, being Consent Calendar day, suspensions, which the Speaker desires to recognize in relation to bills, are in order. There will be two suspensions on Monday: H. R. 4951, agricultural marketing quotas for tobacco. I think this is burley tobacco. The other one is H. R. 4644, the Postal Service Compensation Act of 1955. Following that we will take up H. R. 5046, Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1956.

On Tuesday and Wednesday we will take up House Resolution 174, disapproving resolution, sale of rubber plants, and House Resolution 171, disapproving resolution, sale of certain rubber plants, and, if a rule is reported, H. R. 12, amending the Agricultural Act of 1949. That is the 90 percent of parity section.

Mr. HALLECK. Has a rule been granted on that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not yet, but if a rule is reported out, it will come up.

On Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: Interior Department appropriation bill for 1956, then H. R. 4725, which repeals sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. That is a bill having to do with the section where they found tremendous losses of revenue, greatly in excess of a billion dollars, occurring in last year's internal revenue bill. Then House Resolution 151, code of fair procedure for committees; H. R. 4941, Foreign Service Act amendments of 1955; and H. R. 3659, increase penalties, Sherman Antitrust Act.

Now, it may be that I may not bring some of these bills up in the order that

I have stated them to the Members of the House, but that is approximately the order. That is a pretty active program for next week.

Of course, there is the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS to the amendment offered by Mr. PRESTON: Strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000 to be allotted to the fund of the Food and Agricultural Organization."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

If you will turn to the bottom of page 450 of the hearings, I quote from a statement of Mr. Christopher Phillips:

As of April 30 they would have approximately a million dollars.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] then said:

The rate of obligation from January 1, 1955, to April 30, is approximately \$1,600,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. You say you would theoretically need from the United States for that 2-month period, the difference between \$2.2 million and the \$1 million which you say will be available.

Now, what is really needed is \$2.2 million, and I have offered the amendment to reduce the \$4 million to \$2.5 million on the evidence of the Department, and I have allotted it exclusively to the Food and Agricultural Organization on the basis of the table which appears on page 439 of the hearings. I believe that is a program that this Congress has been trying to support and wants to support and that we want to maintain the independence and the efficiency and the confidence in the Food and Agricultural Organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that every time a bill comes before this House which has for its purpose the spending of the American taxpayers' money for the benefit of foreign countries, somehow or other we lose our equilibrium. I have gone through the testimony presented before the subcommittee which heard this item and not once have I seen any reference made to the welfare or the wellbeing of the people of the United States of America. It just does not make sense to me that while we have a tremendous cotton surplus, while we have tremendous surpluses in other agricultural commodities, and are having to limit production in practically every field of agriculture, we should be taxing these very farmers for the purpose of promoting increased agricultural production abroad.

During the last 10 or 15 years we have spent not millions but billions of dollars to encourage the production of agricultural commodities all over the world with the result that American exports of those commodities have

fallen off. And why? Because they are being choked off the world market by subsidized foreign production—subsidized by the taxpayers of the United States of America.

The chairman of this subcommittee stated that we had no obligation whatsoever, moral, legal, or otherwise, to put 1 single nickel into this so-called point 4 program for this year or for next year. Then why are we doing it? As I understand, we are putting up about 61 percent of the whole amount, if I read the hearings correctly. We are putting up \$105 million of our own money in our own program and then we are adding to that by supporting 61 percent of the United Nations program which duplicates exactly what the United States program does.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am afraid that by past action of the Congress we do have a moral obligation. I want to be fair to the committee and say that we do have a moral obligation because of our action in the past.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If you give me a loaf of bread then I suppose you have a moral obligation to give me another loaf of bread after I have eaten the first loaf?

Mr. GROSS. And how about putting the butter on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman just expressed the thought that I was going to express; that is, having made one loan, we are under obligation to continue forever to make other loans?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Not a loan but a gift.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon for saying it was a loan.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if you will look at page 423 of the hearings you will see a full page taken up in listing the countries we are subsidizing to promote agricultural production which will be in competition with the American farmer. There may be some sense in it, but I cannot see it.

Then if you turn over to page 425 of the hearings you will see where one of the witnesses was questioned as to the overlapping of the programs; that is, the United States \$105 million program and the United Nations program which we are supporting to the degree of 61 percent. The witness said:

In one case, the FOA expert, the United Nations expert, was helping to assist the Government in a program to encourage the raising of calves into full-grown beef steers. The Ecuadorans apparently have a habit of killing off most of their calves after they are a week or two old because they find it economically unproductive to raise them to maturity. They tend to concentrate on dairy cattle instead.

Then he goes on further and says:

The result is that they have a tremendous meat shortage in Ecuador.

We have plenty of meat down in the State of Mississippi that we would like to be able to export to Ecuador, but our cattlemen down there are starving to death because this international giveaway program has driven the price of cattle, because of subsidized foreign production, down to the point where it is not profitable to feed our cattle.

I believe the chairman of the subcommittee mentioned that some 1,000 technical experts work under this program. I believe he said that the United States, furnishing 61 percent of the money that goes into this program, is permitted 14 percent, which would be 140, of these experts. We are not even hiring our own people with our own money, but we are building up competitors who are choking us off the world market. We have been doing the same thing in the field of manufacturing. We have built factories overseas, and now our manufacturers are asking for higher tariffs to protect them against the products of those subsidized foreign concerns.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there is 1 issue and 1 issue alone before the House at this time. In my humble judgment, it is the most serious issue the United States of America faces today. That issue is the question of world cooperation or isolationism.

Mr. Chairman, we refused after World War I to enter the League of Nations. We said at that time that we were separated from the rest of the world by two oceans and that we were going to tend to our own business and were not going to interfere with the affairs of the world. Consequently, we tried to go our way alone.

Twenty years later we found out that we could not isolate ourselves from the rest of the world and we were drawn into another world conflict against our will. By that time we had learned our lesson and we agreed to enter the United Nations.

The program that is before you today is a program of the United Nations, a program in which the member nations are cooperating. It is not a program for which we are taxed. We have no legal obligation to go into this activity, but we have agreed to go along with the United Nations. This is a program which is being conducted by that organization with contributions from the member nations.

According to my information we are not contributing 61 percent to this fund. We contribute 54 percent to the United Nations fund, but the funds of the United Nations are matched by the individual nation in which this technical assistance is rendered, and when the contribution of the individual nation is taken into account we are contributing only 21 percent of the entire program.

This matter came before our committee. Frankly, we felt that the \$8 million requested was too much for us to contribute for the balance of this fiscal year. But the committee, believing that it is a program in which we should participate, recommended to this body that we contribute \$4 million.

It is true that we have a technical-assistance program of our own, a bilateral program, in which the nations to which we contribute match our funds.

In that program we put up the entire money except that which is matched by the nation receiving the assistance. In this program we are contributing to a fund to which the member nations of the United Nations also contribute.

Let me say to you this is not a partisan matter. Ambassador Wadsworth came before our committee. The suggestion has been made that \$2 million is sufficient, he justified \$8 million. He said they needed \$8 million from the United States for this program for the balance of this year. The State Department asked for \$8 million. We did not agree to that amount. We thought \$4 million was a fair figure.

We provided in the bill that that \$4 million should not be a new appropriation, but that it should be taken from other appropriations already made for similar purposes. The gentleman from Michigan raised the point of order which struck out that provision. Consequently, the only way we can make the contribution now is by a direct appropriation. In response to the point of order, the gentleman from Georgia has offered an amendment to make a direct appropriation of \$4 million. I trust it will be the will of this body to support that amendment and to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from California who would cut the amount down to \$2,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell the committee the contributions made by the other nations to which you have referred? Can the gentleman tell the amounts of their contribution?

Mr. GARY. If we have contributed 54 percent, their contributions have been approximately 46 percent of the entire fund.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell us, for instance, how much Britain, France, and the other members of the United Nations have contributed?

Mr. GARY. Those figures are in the record of the hearings, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has just informed me that the figures are on page 420 of the hearings.

Mr. GARY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California would cut the amount and apply the appropriation to one specific purpose and that is the Food and Agriculture Organization. Included in this program is the health program, and many other excellent pro-

grams that are being sponsored by the United Nations.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman overlooks the fact that this is only a supplemental appropriation. There is already money in the fund which can be used for the things which the gentleman is talking about. I am attempting to limit the additional money to a very worthwhile objective. I am not gutting the program. I have nothing to do with the rest of the program—that money was appropriated a year ago.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is trying to limit it to the program which he is particularly interested in. There are other things involved. Is not the gentleman interested in health?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very much, but money was appropriated a year ago for that. This is a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. GARY. But there are other programs involved.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. We have never earmarked any appropriation we have put into this fund. We have provided that the United Nations should do that. If the gentleman will pardon me for saying so, I certainly know he does not intend it, because I have the highest regard for the gentleman's opinion, but in my judgment his amendment would be telling the United Nations how they should run their business. I think we have done too much of that in the United States. I think we ought to cooperate with these various nations.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman mean that we should not tell them how to spend the money that we appropriate to them?

Mr. GARY. I mean to say that we should not try to dictate to them how they should do it. Of course, we should voice our views as one of the member nations, but not as a dictator who stands off and tries to run the entire program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. But the gentleman knows they took the money we appropriated and spent it for something that was not authorized in competition with programs which are separately financed.

Mr. GARY. No, I do not know that because all of these items are a part of the general program and we appropriated money for the general program and I hope we will continue to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] just said there was but one issue before us. That is true. But it is not the one to which he referred. The issue is whether we are going to give the United Nations another \$4 million and add it to the national debt.

But the issue, he said, was world cooperation. Now, think that over. Just when, since we have been sticking our national nose into the business of other nations, and then at their request, and loaning—no, usually giving—them

money by the billion, have we had wholehearted disinterested cooperation from any nation in Europe or in the world? Is Great Britain cooperating today? I guess not. She is trading with Russia. She wants us to fuss around over in Formosa just so far and no farther than will serve her interests. She is talking about asking Nationalist China to give up certain islands but she hangs on to Hong Kong. She asks us to agree to that policy while she seems to want Red China in U. N. That cooperation business is all nonsense. The only time there is any cooperation is when we do what they want us to do: fight their battles, levy a burden upon our taxpayers to give them money to spend as they wish, and they resent any suggestions or any advice from us as to how they should use those funds. They use much of it to provide their people with things our people cannot afford.

Another thing the gentleman said, that our troubles are due to the fact that we have been trying to go it alone since World War I. I challenge the accuracy of that statement. As I read the record, we have not tried to go it alone in the interest of America since 1916. No; not once. All the time we have been trying to serve the interest of, do what some other nation or nations wanted. All we were permitted to do, all we have done is to pay the larger part of the cost, whether it was in lives or in dollars, of the effort to solve the problems, get out of the wars into which they or the U. N. has dragged us—and do not forget Korea where U. N. sent thousands of our men to die but denied them the opportunity to win.

We just enacted legislation a week or two ago which, according to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], will add \$36 billion to our annual expenditures. Where is the money coming from? From already overburdened taxpayers. Give U. N. another \$4 million but not by my vote. The money will not come from that \$20 exemption provision in the tax bill the majority party put over a week or so ago. You vote to cut taxes then you vote \$4 million which we must borrow as a gift to U. N. Then we added something like a million and a half for an increase in our own compensation—long deserved, earned by burning the midnight oil, and by sweat, and so on. Oh, yes.

We passed another one the other day, an increase in compensation for those in the armed services, and I voted for it.

We have another one coming in for increased compensation for the postal workers, and I am going to vote for an increase if the other provisions of the administration bill are adopted.

In fact, I have changed my whole approach on these items. So long as we are going bankrupt, not only the Nation but the taxpayers, the quicker we get it over with the better, because I hope to be able to assist in digging us out of the pit we are bound to get into if we continue as we have.

Then there is another bill coming up for increase in compensation for all Federal workers. And then we will have this \$1.25 minimum-wage law, and if and when that comes to the floor I may offer

an amendment requiring that the Federal Treasury will pay to each employer who does not have the money a sum sufficient to meet that hourly wage of \$1.25, and a further amendment providing that all customers who live in the neighborhood of that employer shall be required to purchase sufficient of his merchandise or production at a price so that he can continue in business with a profit, and that the consumers, the would-be purchasers, if they do not have the money to make such purchases, shall be given enough from the United States Treasury so that they can make those purchases. If we can get all those enacted, then everybody is going to be happy. We will have a merry-go-round that will really whirl—make us all dizzy—but happy. Who is going to supply the food and clothing and a roof over the house? I guess it will have to be the good Lord. If we are ever to avoid economic disaster, we show no disposition to escape it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. And will the gentleman also offer an amendment to increase the appropriation so that we can build larger printing presses to print this money?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the suggestion is a reasonable one, but could we not just change a few figures—just add a few more ciphers on the side of the decimal point, and let it go at that? Why not do away with the dollar bill and make it a hundred-dollar bill. Why not?

We have one issue before us today: Are you going farther than we have gone down the road of irresponsibility to ruin by giving the United Nations \$4 million more when they already have millions on hand—\$4 million more—and then add it to the tax roll? That is the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would simply like to point out to the Committee figures here on the desk regarding the contribution of the United States to this program. In the regular appropriation bill the amount we contribute amounted to \$14 million.

It has been stated that other nations contributed to the program, and that is true. I should like further to point out to the Committee the amount they contributed. Understand, we are contributing \$14 million, and if we pass this item it will be \$18 million. The contribution of France is \$1,448,571—and we are contributing \$14 million, and they are asking us now to contribute \$18 million. The contribution of Italy is \$200,000—and we have contributed \$14 million, and they are asking us to contribute \$18 million.

The contribution of the United Kingdom is \$2,240,000. We have contributed \$14 million, and they are asking us to contribute \$18 million.

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked in this supplemental appropriation bill to contribute more than the other nations contribute throughout the entire year, although we have already contributed \$14 million.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the time has come when we must consider the American taxpayer, the American farmer, American industry, the American workingman, and not put items of this kind in supplemental bills which will increase our contribution to \$18 million in comparison to the contributions of other nations which I have pointed out.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I am sure the gentleman wants to be accurate in his figures.

Mr. BOW. I certainly do.

Mr. GARY. We are contributing this fiscal year \$9,900,000, not \$14 million.

Mr. BOW. Then the percentage figure that has been given us is in error, I may say to the gentleman from Virginia, because the gentleman from California has given me the figure of \$14 million. I will accept the \$9 million if that be true.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. I will accept the \$9 million, if that be true. Add \$4 million, and you have \$13 million, and compare it with the contributions the other nations have made, and you will find we are going down a pretty dangerous road in our fiscal policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] would have you believe that this is a program by which we buy friends and influence people. In the same breath he admits that in committee he helped reduce this from \$8 million to \$4 million. If we can buy friends with \$4 million why does not the gentleman advocate the spending of \$8 million? Why not have double the friends, if this is the medium by which you are going to buy friends and influence people? The gentleman I think in his own heart does not believe that.

The gentleman indicates that some of us who oppose this sort of thing are isolationists. I should like to ask the gentleman how many of the member nations of the United Nations got into the war in Korea with combat troops? The figures show that only 14 nations participated in the Korean war, exclusive of the United States, and these contributed only token numbers of combat soldiers. Forty-five nations contributed not one single combat soldier to the war in Korea. He knows that to be true, and he knows that with the billions upon billions of dollars we are spending on these foreign aid, give-away programs, we are not buying friends and we are not influencing people. I do not know where he would go or anyone else would go with any assurance for a powerful ally if a shooting war came tomorrow. Suppose fighting broke

out around Formosa tomorrow would the British come to our assistance? We have no such assurance.

We have warships all over that part of the Pacific. Are the British or any other nation helping us with that patrol? If they are it is not a matter of record.

Then who are the real isolationists? They are the 45 member nations of the United Nations who refused to shed a drop of blood in defense of South Korea although they have the same responsibility to the United Nations Charter that we have. They are the 14 other member nations of the United Nations which went through the motions of taking part in the Korean war.

Thirty-five thousand American dead in that conflict as compared with only about 3,000 for the rest of the United Nations is the real and uncontradicted story of isolationism.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, frankly I am opposed to this item because of the way this outfit has performed and the record it has made. I may say that, according to the testimony on pages 448 and 449 of the hearings, if they were given \$4 million more, they would have for operating in the period from January 1, 1955, the sum of \$13,900,000 subscribed by the United States. According to the testimony given by Mr. Phillips, representing the agency—and there is a difference between that Mr. Phillips and our Mr. PHILLIPS, of California—that outfit on the basis of \$1,600,000 a month would have sufficient funds to carry it for 8½ months. That is just plain, ordinary, simple arithmetic.

They offered no justification for this amount of money. If you give them \$2 million, they would have a very liberal amount; if you give them \$2½ million, which the gentleman from California has proposed, they would have an exceedingly liberal amount. Therefore I shall be obliged to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, there is more involved in the question before the House at the moment than money. The question of our participation in the United Nations is involved. Unfavorable action by the House today will be construed throughout the world as a very definite trend in this country of a rising opposition to our participation in the United Nations. There are some people who would like to see us withdraw. There are some in this body, and you have heard them speak today, who would by the stroke of the pen eliminate us entirely from the United Nations. But when we stop to think about what a large degree of our national potential is going into national defense and how little we spend in peaceful efforts, it is deplorable. Bring a bill before the House today that carries 100 submarines and nobody will vote against it, but bring in a bill with a paltry \$4 million for sending technicians throughout the world in a peaceful effort and you find many

supporters of the proposition that you are spurning your own people, you are denying your own people help while squandering money all over the world. It is the popular thing to do.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. First, we do have \$105 million in the United States technical-assistance program operating in those same nations.

Mr. PRESTON. That has been brought out previously in the debate, it is unquestioned. But there is involved here, as I said a moment ago, the question of the trend of the people in our country. Are we for the United Nations or are we not? If that is the consensus of our leaders in Government that we need to appropriate \$4 million additional for this cause, then why not give them a chance to use it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 52, noes 74.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRESTON and Mr. TABER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 89, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: After the amendment just adopted, insert the following paragraph:

"The sums provided in the foregoing paragraph shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation contained in Public Law 778, 83d Congress, for assistance authorized by section 121 of Public Law 665, 83d Congress."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. The committee would be glad to accept the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think I should say simply that it takes it out of a transfer instead of directly out of the Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the provision that was stricken from the bill

on a point of order. What the gentleman from New York now proposes to do is to use \$4 million that they give to the President in the bill which such paragraph sought to amend and which was referred to previously—it is carried in the original paragraph—take \$4 million away from him, from President Eisenhower and give it to the United Nations. Well, perhaps the majority of the House thinks United Nations can put \$4 million to better use than the President. I do not. There is no assurance that when those who support this amendment have taken the \$4 million away from the President and given it to U. N. they will not ask for \$8 million, \$12 million, or \$16 million additional to replace that, give him a little extra velvet to go on, and plug the hole caused by the transfer of this \$4 million with another four or five million.

The issue is plain enough. It is whether when the United Nations still has millions on hand which they have not spent, we are going to take \$4 million more and give it to them to spend as they may wish.

I do not intend to fuss about it. Because of the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who works so hard, who mistakenly in this instance, thinks he will save \$1 million by a transfer. I will not now make the objection to his amendment which I made to the same language which was in the bill and which was stricken. The issue is clear enough. If you want to go on record, as you will before we are through with this, if I can bring it about, to give the United Nations \$4 million when we are in debt the way we are, paying some \$7 billion dollars interest on the national debt, and we need tax revenues, which some insist we shall not have, that is your privilege. If the House puts this through, then the gentlemen who voted for that \$20 tax exemption deduction will have to rescind that action; will they not? Or just let the debt and interest charges roll on and up.

We are short of tax dollars to meet the demands of our own people but if Members prefer to give the four million additional to U. N., which to date by its actions, has shown it has little interest in the United States except to milk its people dry—that, as has been said—is the privilege of each Member. I want no part of such a program. Give the U. N. another four million and then explain to your needy deserving constituents why you cannot meet their requests—tell it to the postal employees—sing it to those needy who are on relief in your own district.

I have had more than enough of the U. N.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Jones Point bridge

For expenses necessary for the preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates for the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 963, 964); \$600,000; to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask someone on the Committee on Appropriations about this \$600,000 appropriation for the Jones Point bridge. I understand this is for preliminary survey work or something of that nature.

Mr. TABER. It means just what it says, a preliminary survey and all the other kinds of survey and planning in connection with the bridge and the approaches to it, whatever has to be done with respect to the folks who want to sell or do not want to sell property in connection with the approaches.

Mr. GROSS. What contribution are the States of Maryland and Virginia making to this preliminary survey?

Mr. TABER. I do not think they are making any.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. TABER. They seem to have been able to get by with it on previous occasions.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what I thought. These two States are going to be directly benefited. I do not know that anybody is coming out in the State of Iowa and building any bridges for anybody there.

Mr. TABER. They let you in Iowa pay for them, just as they let me pay for them in my territory. They are so rich down here they want to be made richer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 9, line 22, strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will not labor this amendment, but I think \$300,000 is a reasonable contribution; that is, the States of Virginia and Maryland can each contribute \$150,000 to this preliminary survey work. Since they are going to be directly benefited by this bridge, they can very easily each contribute \$150,000 and spare the taxpayers of the entire country the full cost of this work.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman's amendment goes through and this is cut in half, should there not be a further amendment that the Maryland-Virginia landlords do not add to the rent of the Federal employees to collect that money to make the \$150,000 contribution?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether we have any assurance that this will not be a toll bridge, with the States of Virginia and Maryland collecting the tolls.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think we will have to move down to Virginia or Maryland to get a bridge of our own and then move it to Iowa or Michigan?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman makes a good point.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a reasonable amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an item which was unanimously adopted by your subcommittee and the Department of the Interior. There is nothing that we can do about it, and there is nothing we should do about it. We ought not to cut the matter up piecemeal. It was authorized by an act of Congress. We tried to do the job as we deemed was proper. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Arkansas stated, this matter was resolved last year. The House of Representatives unanimously approved the authorization for the construction of this bridge at a cost of approximately \$14,750,000. The original bill authorizing the construction of this bridge at Jones Point called for an amount of \$20 million. When it was increased from a 4- to 6-lane project, the cost was estimated at \$24 million. That included certain approaches and highways running about 2 or 3 miles to the bridge. The Committee on the District of Columbia thought that the two States involved should pay for the cost of construction of those approaches. In addition to that, there is approximately \$5 million or \$10 million additional cost to bring the other approaches and feeder roads up to the bridge. This is a metropolitan Washington problem. There is a responsibility of the Federal Government in the construction of this bridge because this is the Nation's Capital. The bridge would provide a bypass for the large amount of traffic now going through Washington. It would bypass Washington entirely. The States involved should contribute something to the cost of these highways and bridges. They do so by paying approximately \$10 million to \$14 million for the approaches. They could provide the entire cost of the bridge if the Federal Government, which happens to be the principal industry here, were paying its share of the taxes to the various communities. The Federal Government is the principal industry here and it does not pay taxes which means a loss of revenue for the communities in this area of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$75 million to \$100 million a year. I would much prefer to receive the taxes from the Federal Government, to which these communities are entitled rather than to have the Federal Government by piecemeal measures pay its share of these obligations. The Department of the Interior in requesting this appropriation asked for \$675,000. They stated that was a minimum needed to provide for the various surveys and plans for the construction of this bridge. The Committee on Appropriations deemed it advisable to cut that down to \$600,000. I had intended to offer an amendment to increase that to \$675,000 but I decided it was better to go ahead and do the best we could with the \$600,-

000. The surrounding communities do not have the money to pay the difference between the \$300,000 requested by the gentleman from Iowa and the \$600,000. It would just mean that much more delay in the construction of this bridge and in the financing of that construction. It is going to have to be constructed sooner or later and we may as well face it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

I agree with the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, and I would point out that the primary purpose of this bridge is to alleviate the congested traffic conditions in the Federal District of Columbia. So that this bridge is not for the benefit of just the people of the States of Maryland and Virginia, but for the benefit of all the people who are in and pass through the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIER) there were—ayes 12, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise to ask the chairman of the committee if the amount appropriated for the Veterans' Administration is not just what they asked for. I was told that it was. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is exactly right. The lady is 100 percent correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

For an additional amount for "International contingencies," \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from "Educational aid for China and Korea."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any part of the 5 minutes. I simply want to call attention to what you are going to vote for under this particular title.

Under the \$600,000 appropriation, some \$335,000, I understand, is to provide for about 20 Americans in the establishment of two embassies in Cambodia and Laos. I say again I think there are about 20 Americans involved at an expenditure of \$335,000.

Then there is \$12,500 for missions to international organizations. I imagine that is another giveaway.

Under "International contingencies," it is proposed to spend probably \$35,000, on 30 to 35 people to travel from New York to San Francisco. In other words,

you are spending about \$1,000 a head per week on these emissaries to travel out to San Francisco to commemorate the organization of that Tower of Babel known as the United Nations.

I think probably all of these items are subject to a point of order, but I am not going to make a point of order, because I suspect what would happen is this: We would walk up the aisle and we would walk back down the other aisle, and we have another amendment introduced for a direct appropriation, and that would be followed by another amendment to provide for the same thing that was stricken out on the point of order. That is what happened earlier this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you not realize that even when they make a transfer they fill the hole where they took it away with another appropriation just the same, and it all ends up with an addition to the national debt?

Mr. GROSS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Has the gentleman checked into the matter far enough to know whether any of these supplemental funds will be used to implement the general agreements on trade and tariffs, better known as GATT?

Mr. GROSS. That raises another interesting point. We have got to the place here in this House where we have to give assurance to everybody in every foreign land that we have not overlooked them. When we passed the 4-year extension of the draft spokesmen for the measure came down here in the well of the House asserting it must be done in order to give assurance to our so-called foreign friends that we were backing them. Then, in the matter of the Trade Agreements Act, the free-trade bill, we were told we had to pass that for a 3-year period to give assurance to our foreign friends that we had not overlooked something that we could do for them somehow, somewhere, no matter how much the cost to us. When, I ask, do we give assurance to our own people, who are paying the bills, that they are our primary concern?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman know that the United Nations has taken us over? What is the gentleman kicking about?

Mr. GROSS. I suppose I am getting to be something like the gentleman from Michigan; I have got to kick to show that I can kick when I know something is wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right, if it is something worth while.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN MAIL TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Foreign mail transportation," \$25,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Railway mail service," fiscal year 1947.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that on Monday a motion will be made to suspend the rules and pass what is known as the pay-raise bill for the postal field service. I hope that between now and Monday each Member of the House will read the minority report which has been filed and which points out that we have not just a simple salary bill to consider. Instead, it is a substantial grant of authority from this Congress to the Postmaster General, authority so broad that if used unwisely it could effectively destroy morale among the postal workers. It is a bill which proposes for those in the top categories increases in many instances of from 30 to 50 percent or more, yet proposes for the great bulk of the postal field service workers—the clerks, the carriers, the motor-vehicle workers who make up some 60 percent of the total number of employees of the service—a raise of about 6.8 percent.

If the House permits the rules to be suspended and denies the membership an opportunity to understand fully what is being proposed, it will be doing a disservice to each Member of the House and to every employee of the postal field service. This is far-reaching legislation affecting vitally the welfare of those who are charged with the responsibility of providing a very basic service to this Nation. It should be passed upon only on the basis of sound judgment. Every Member of this body should have a full opportunity to debate it. We have twice during this session acted upon salary legislation. We have increased our own compensation—and I voted for that, for I felt it was completely justified. We increased the compensation of members of the armed services. I voted for that for it was completely justified. I would like to give equal justice to the employees of the postal establishment. I want every Member of this House to have an equal opportunity to acquaint himself fully with all the facts and recognize that the bill is two-headed.

It provides for both reclassification and salary increases and the reclassification provisions require modification, through amendments, if we are to provide for some neutral review of the Post Office Department reclassification such as is required of the actions of any other department of Government.

The amount of the salary increase proposed for the bulk of the postal workers is inadequate. We cannot justify the discrimination against the majority of the postal employees which is contained in H. R. 4464 as reported to the House.

I am confident that, with full and careful debate providing for the consideration of reasonable amendments, we can produce a bill which many Members who now oppose H. R. 4464 will support. We cannot achieve such a bill under the gag-rule procedure which will inevitably follow if we vote for suspension of the rules.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express to the Appropriations Committee as well as the subcommittee, my appreciation for the excellent work they have done on the

section in this bill concerning funds for use in the Great Plains section on wind erosion soil control.

There remained \$7,147,000 unspent from the Third Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1954. Under the provisions of H. R. 4903 now being considered, these remaining funds may now be used in this wind-erosion program.

Let me quote from the committee report:

The prolonged nature of the drought in many areas, and the strong possibility of further severe damage this year due to lack of moisture and dust storms, present a serious national problem which can be met only by a farsighted and long-range conservation program vigorously prosecuted throughout the country. The committee urges the Department to give this matter even closer attention than in the past, and asks that it give careful study to all legislation and other proposals designed to meet various phases of the problem. It invites the Department to work closely with the Congress on this program, especially with the Agriculture and Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

And in addition a report as of yesterday from the Soil Conservation Service:

SPECIAL REPORT ON WIND EROSION CONDITIONS, GREAT PLAINS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, MARCH 17, 1955

Severe wind storms during the first half of March, particularly on March 10 and 11, damaged both crop and rangeland in those Great Plains States where drought has persisted. Land damage during the intense storm of March 10 and 11 exceeded the damage in any previous month during this blow season. Figures, by States, are given below:

State	Land damaged Mar. 1-15, 1955	Total land damage 1954-55 season	Additional land likely to blow in 1955
Colorado.....	519, 000	1, 3, 022, 696	1, 3, 589, 237
Kansas.....	595, 000	1, 825, 400	1, 5, 955, 222
New Mexico.....	335, 000	355, 000	1, 291, 000
Oklahoma.....	174, 140	293, 833	1, 605, 000
Texas.....	49, 225	1, 705, 467	1, 5, 048, 640
Nebraska.....	76, 800	225, 302	1, 742, 865
Wyoming.....	226, 100	1, 000, 000	1, 928, 013

¹ Figures taken from Mar. 1 conditions.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say to the gentleman that the subcommittee was convinced that the situation out there is still bad, and we thought it was good business to make available the balance of the unexpended funds.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is correct. It does not add any more to the budget.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the people out in that region owe a debt of gratitude to the Soil Conservation Service for the splendid way in which they are attempting to do something worth while in this line. Too many of us are apt to forget the additional burdens put upon that Service during emergencies. That has been one reason why I personally have felt that the budget given the Department of Agriculture for the next fiscal year has been too little as far as the Soil Conservation Service is concerned.

Mr. HILL. May I say that I am sure there is no section of these United States

where the farm people on the land are more appreciative of the assistance given to them by the Congress than our friends in the drought-stricken area.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Capitol Grounds: For reconstruction, repair, alteration, and improvement of the areas of the United States Capitol Grounds located above and in the vicinity of the legislative garage, situated north of Constitution Avenue between New Jersey Avenue and Delaware Avenue, including expenditures for personal and other services and all other necessary items, \$611,000, to remain available until expended.

House Office Buildings: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, to carry out the provisions of Public Law 176, 80th Congress, approved July 11, 1947, relating to erection of an additional House Office Building, including accommodations for parking automobiles, \$25,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAYBURN: On page 19 strike out all of lines 5 through 10, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert:

"CHAPTER XII-A

"ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

"Sec. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary access facilities over or under public streets and such other appurtenant or necessary facilities as may be approved by such Commission.

"Sec. 1202. (a) If the site upon which the building authorized to be constructed by section 1201 of this act is not within the United States Capitol Grounds as defined in the act entitled 'An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes,' approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., secs. 193a-193m), the Architect is authorized to acquire such site by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and upon acquisition of such site and completion of the building, such building, and the grounds, sidewalks, and facilities surrounding it, shall be subject to the provisions of (1) of the act of May 4, 1907, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 175) (relating to the control, supervision, and care of the House Office Building), and (2) the act entitled 'An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes,' approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., sec. 193a-193m).

"(b) Any proceedings for condemnation brought under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled 'An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States,' approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619-644).

"Sec. 1203. For carrying out the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated \$2 million, to remain available until expended; and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

"Sec. 1204. This subchapter may be cited as the 'Additional House Office Building Act of 1955'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the emergency involved, and the urgent need of the facility for which the appropriation is proposed, the committee

accepts this amendment and approves the expenditure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order does come too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How does it come too late when I was on my feet seeking recognition before the gentleman was recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, as chairman of the committee, was recognized first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say the rule that requires recognition of the chairman of a committee would deprive another Member from making a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No. Did the gentleman address the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did address the Chair before the Clerk finished reading.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the proper time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was on my feet and addressed the Chair before the Clerk finished and as soon as he finished. Now, if I have to shout louder, I can do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could not recognize the gentleman until the Clerk had finished reading.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee what is the emergency that compels us to construct a new office building, and what is going to be the cost of this building?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I can say this to the gentleman, that if he were on the House Office Building Commission and had a dozen people coming to him every day asking for additional space, why he would understand something about the necessity for building a building that gives us more space. They do need this building very badly, and this is a start on it; I think a good start. Of course, I must admit that this Commission that is going to handle it is a very fine Commission, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is a member of it.

Mr. GROSS. I would agree with that.

Mr. RAYBURN. And the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and one of the finest men of the House and a man who probably knows more about public buildings than anyone, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS]. I do not think this Commission is going to run wild on anything. But I do know that we need additional space here to carry on efficiently the work of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], is this going to be an ornamental type of building again, or is

it going to be a functional type of building? What are we getting into here?

I am concerned, and deeply concerned, because things are happening out in the State of Iowa today that are not good for the economy of the State or of this country. Let me say to the gentleman that last year 54 percent of the farmers of the State of Iowa did not make sufficient income to pay a State income tax. I am concerned—and I want the gentleman to understand that I make this inquiry in the utmost sincerity—about this spending situation. We are putting up buildings on the Capitol Grounds, tremendous structures, and a great deal of money is going into them. I want to know the necessity for these expenditures.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think it is very necessary for the Members of the Congress, in order to serve the State of Iowa, as well as the other 47 States, to have the instruments and the room in which to work to perform their duties.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just came into the Chamber to hear part of the debate going on over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

I happen to walk through the hallways of this Capitol Building nearly every day, and have for a good many years. I notice, and I am sure other Members have noticed, that partitions have been built setting off parts of the hallways or corridors in order to obtain more office space. The same has been done over in the new and old House Office Buildings. They have had to cut off some of the hallways in order to obtain more office space.

Certainly the people of the United States would be willing for us, as representatives of a great Nation, to have sufficient space in order to carry on the business of their Government. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made. I have not had as close a connection with the matter of proper housing to carry on the functions of the House of Representatives as has been had by the gentleman who has just spoken or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. However, I have been sufficiently close to the matter to know that as the responsibilities of the Congress have increased in recent years, we have found ourselves in all sorts of additional activities. Different functions must be carried on. I know of my own knowledge that we need additional space, and I sincerely hope that this amendment will be adopted and that we may get on with the construction of this building that I say is justified and necessary.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to close my remarks by saying this. I have never been charged in this Chamber with being one who is willing to spend the people's money for nothing. I am known here as a conservative. But here is an amendment

which I think we should all support in the interest of the common welfare of the American people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not finding fault with the substance of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], our Speaker.

For 15 years I have been trying to get a decent place for Congressmen to eat, entertain their homelike, and still have the time to perform their duties. But I have not seen any amendment come from that side of the aisle, I have not seen any amendment offered by the gentleman who is offering this amendment to do anything to provide that which everyone knows we need, which we have needed for 20 years. But that is not my point at all. My point is this.

I have been told from the well of the House, by the Speaker, who offered this amendment, that this is one of the greatest deliberative bodies in the world. I have heard that more than once from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and on several occasions the gentleman has coupled with it the statement that our proceedings should be orderly and in accordance with the rules of the House—the House which he dearly loved.

Yet, while we are supposed to be operating under rules to which the gentleman has called our attention, what happened today, just a few moments ago? The Members of the House saw what happened. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] offered an amendment which was obviously in violation of a House rule. I was on my feet seeking recognition by the Chair, for I saw the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] standing by the Speaker on the other side of the aisle. I knew I must make my point of order before debate on the amendment began. At least twice while the amendment was being read I addressed the Chair seeking to make a point of order—when the Clerk finished reading I again addressed the Chair, saying, "Mr. Chairman, a point of order." Twice I addressed the Chair—and in no whisper. Instead of giving me the recognition to which I was entitled, the Chair recognized the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the committee, who being recognized, said my point of order came too late. It did not come too late. It was made at the proper time, but apparently on advice of someone I was refused the recognition to which I was entitled under the rules. I do not charge any conspiracy between that gentleman and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. Oh, no; I do not charge that at all. But what they did was to so arrange things so that the gentleman in the chair, as was not his prerogative, instead of recognizing me when I was trying to obtain recognition, both before the Clerk had just finished reading and after, recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. So, by their procedure, they did what? They deprived a member of the minority, a Member of the House from the Fourth District of Michigan, of the opportunity, under the rules, an opportunity which

he should have, a right given him by the rules of the House, to which the Speaker has so often asked us to adhere, to make a point of order. How can a Member make a point of order if, when on his feet, in a loud voice, almost a shout, addressing the Chair, he says, "Mr. Chairman," then adds, "A point of order, Mr. Chairman," when the Chairman refuses to see him. If that is legislating deliberately, all right. I will say that that is what I call a gag rule, an arbitrary ruling or procedure, which deprives a Member of the House, which on this occasion deprived the Member from Michigan, of a privilege, of a right, that is given him under the rules of the House, rules under which the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was out of order. The statement of the Chair that he could not recognize me before the Clerk finished reading, if followed, would prevent the making of a point of order when the House was out of order—an absurdity. Moreover, I was on my feet addressing the Chair, as 50 Members of the House well know, when the Clerk finished reading the amendment.

If you like that kind of procedure, all right. But do not ever come around to me and do not ever cry babylike, from the well of the House, of a fancied violation of the rules—do not preach or cry to me about the sacredness of the rules of the House, about something that may happen over here on this side. And it was all so unnecessary. Why not the legislation in the amendment in a bill in the regular way—sent to a committee? Was there something requiring secrecy, haste? Was there an emergency? Rules made for me to obey are rules for all to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill. It has several provisions which are of special interest to my constituents and which are very pleasing to me.

Four million dollars is appropriated for contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance. This is a good program and luckily the Soviet Union did not want to be in it. It is the kind of a program that should be helpful in building up our friendship and cooperation with countries which are or want to be a part of the free world. The gentleman from Georgia, Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, expressed my views. He is on the subcommittee that proposed this amount and his knowledge of the situation in some of the countries who may be benefited by this money was fortified by a personal trip which he made to look into this program to determine its worth. He endorsed the program as well as the amount and method of its expenditure very highly. Mr. TABER offered an amendment with which I concurred providing that the money for this project should come out of unexpended balances.

It happens that I have a bill, H. R. 2980, which is now pending in the Committee on Education and Labor which

proposes to authorize money to be spent to provide classrooms for the public schools. The appropriation bill now being considered provides for an additional amount for assistance for school construction, \$48,500,000. The people of my district will be very much pleased and also very grateful for any part of this which may come as an aid in developing our schools.

The Appropriations Committee showed commendable selectivity in picking out projects and programs that should be given Federal assistance.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the committee disapproved the item of \$8 million for the United Nations technical assistance program requested by the Bureau of the Budget. There is a demonstrated value in the work of this agency, and the 50 percent cut would seriously impair its work. Technical assistance is relatively inexpensive. It represents a constructive effort to help people to improve living standards. It is based upon the self-help principle and the cooperation of recipient nations. This type of technical assistance parallels and does not conflict with our bilateral program which has won such widespread support. Some types of technical assistance for agricultural, health, and related programs can be most effectively promoted under international auspices. It is an important phase of our foreign policy and serves our national interest as well as promoting the welfare of people around the world.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Preston amendment to chapter IV, and on the Taber amendment to chapter IV.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is the amendment to which the gentleman from Mississippi refers the \$4 million amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want a separate vote on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on both amendments.

The SPEAKER. We have hardly reached that point yet, under the rules of the House.

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 11, page 7, insert:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
"Mutual security

"Contributions to the United Nations
Expanded

"Program of technical assistance

"For an additional amount for 'Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance,' for United States contributions during the period ending June 30, 1955, \$4,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 175, nays 107, not voting 152, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—175

Addonizio	Cooley	Halleck
Albert	Coon	Harris
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Harrison, Va.
Allen, Ill.	Cramer	Harvey
Aspinall	Cunningham	Hays, Ark.
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mass.	Hébert
Avery	Deane	Herlong
Ayres	Dempsey	Heslton
Baldwin	Denton	Hinshaw
Barden	Diggs	Holfeld
Bass, N. H.	Doyle	Holmes
Bass, Tenn.	Edmondson	Holtzman
Bates	Elliott	Hope
Bennett, Fla.	Engle	Hosmer
Blatnik	Evins	Hyde
Blitch	Feighan	Ikard
Boggs	Fernandez	Jarman
Boland	Fino	Johnson, Calif.
Bolling	Fogarty	Johnson, Wis.
Bonner	Forand	Jonas
Bowler	Ford	Karsten
Brooks, Tex.	Fountain	Kean
Brown, Ga.	Frazier	Keating
Broyhill	Gamble	Kelley, Pa.
Buchanan	Gary	Kilgore
Burleson	Gathings	King, Calif.
Burnside	Gordon	Knutson
Byrd	Green, Oreg.	Lanham
Cannon	Gregory	Lankford
Carnahan	Gubser	LeCompte
Chelf	Hagen	Lesinski
Cole	Hale	Long

McCormack
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Mills
Mollohan
Morgan
Moss
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norrell
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin

Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roosevelt
Schwengel
Selden
Shelley
Sieminski
Sikes

Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Yates
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—107

Abernethy
Alexander
Alger
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andresen,
August H.
Arends
Bailey
Baker
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bow
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ohio
Budge
Burdick
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Carlyle
Chenoweth
Church
Clevenger
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Dies
Dixon
Dolliver
Dondero
Dowdy
Fisher
Fjare

Forrester
Gentry
George
Gray
Gross
Gwinn
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Henderson
Hiestand
Hill
Hoffman, Mich.
Horan
Jackson
Jenkins
Jensen
Jones, N. C.
Kearns
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Mason
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson

O'Konski
Passman
Phillips
Poff
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
Saylor
Schenck
Short
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Thompson, Mich.
Tuck
Utt
Van Zandt
Vursell
Westland
Wharton
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Young

NOT VOTING—152

Abblitt
Adair
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Barrett
Becker
Bell
Bentley
Betts
Bolton
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bosch
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brownson
Buckley
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Chipfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Colmer
Corbett
Coudert
Cretella
Crumacker
Curtis, Mo.
Davidson

Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Derounian
Devereux
Dingell
Dodd
Dolling
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Durham
Eberhart
Ellsworth
Fallon
Fascell
Fenton
Fine
Flood
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gavin
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Haley
Hardy
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hess
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holt

Huddleston
Hull
James
Jennings
Johansen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Kearney
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Krueger
Lane
Latham
Love
McCarthy
McConnell
McDonald
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Wash.
Martin
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Morano
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Minn.
Patman

Patterson
Pillion
Prouty
Reece, Tenn.
Riehlman
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robson, Ky.
Rooney
Sadlak
St. George
Scherer
Scott

Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Sheppard
Shuford
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Steed
Thompson, N. J.
Wright
Zelenko

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. Boyle with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Cretella.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Carrigg.
Mr. Winstead with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Love.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Miller of New Jersey.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Dorn of New York.
Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Devereux.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Chase.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Mack of Washington.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Morrison with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. James.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. McDonald with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Andrews with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Eberhart with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Flood with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Robson of Kentucky.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Chipfield.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Shuford with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Crumacker.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the amendment just adopted insert the following paragraph:

"The sums provided in the foregoing paragraph shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation contained in Public Law 778, 83d Congress, for assistance authorized by section 121 of Public Law 665, 83d Congress."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, March 24, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES: THEIR NEED, THEIR ENEMIES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include therein pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a former very able, patriotic, and experienced member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Kit Clardy, on February 12, 1955, at Chicago, in an instructive talk, made clear the need for congressional committees and the procedure they follow. That talk is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES: THEIR NEED, THEIR ENEMIES
(Speech by Kit Clardy at Chicago, Ill., February 12, 1955)

A year ago last November while making a speech at Flint I was summoned to the phone on a Washington call. It was then

that I learned that the chairman of my committee, Mr. VELDE, had just subpoenaed Harry Truman and Tom Clark. By sheer coincidence I was interrupted in the midst of advocating precisely the course the chairman had followed.

At the chairman's request I boarded the next plane for Washington. The next few days and weeks were indeed hectic and crowded. The left-wing columnists, radio and television commentators and those they could influence poured out their vitriol. We were the subject of abuse from one end of the country to the other. And all because we had dared to suggest that those who had guilty knowledge of how Communists had gotten into and remained in high places in government ought to be compelled to explain their part in the whole dirty business.

I'll come back to the Harry Dexter White case and what it really means but first I shall try to set the stage, so to speak. There are many things we must understand if committee investigations are to have meaning. We must get away from the misleading small talk and the smear campaigns, if the need for congressional investigations is to be really understood. And we must know the real enemies of such committees—we must know why they attack and smear. We must understand that their attacks are not accidental—that they are in fact all part of a planned campaign.

What would you think if I told you that a number of past and present Members of both Senate and House have been either witting or unwitting members of or cooperated with Communist fronts? Yet, as I shall show you later it's literally true that even Members of Congress have been sucked in by the Communists and their friends or dupes.

Now I don't want it thought that I'm calling such folks Communists. I'm merely trying to show you just how effective the Communists have been in putting over their planned program of infiltration. I'm doing it to show you how really necessary congressional investigations are if an informed people are to defeat the Marxist determination to destroy us. I'm doing it to show you the lack of awareness we face in this fight.

Lenin long ago said that it was vitally necessary to Communist plans of conquest to get Soviet politicians into Parliament and that they must then disrupt the Parliament to prepare the ground for the Soviet's forthcoming task of dispersing Parliament. There's much more along this line but it all adds up to the fact that part of the Communist plan of conquest embraces the duping of folks in all levels of society including particularly people in government.

I'd like you to now ask yourselves some questions. What do you think would be the situation today if Dick Nixon and his committee had not gone after Alger Hiss hammer and tongs? What if they had not opened up the Harry Dexter White scandal? What if the Amerasia case had not been investigated? What if Truman's red-berring coverup had been successful? What if the tremendous unmaskings made by MARTIN DIES had been prevented—as Roosevelt tried to do?

And I'd like you to ask yourselves some questions along another line. What would be the world situation today if the early work of MARTIN DIES and those who followed him on my committee had been studied and used in making both foreign and domestic policy? Is it not plainly apparent that if, when DIES gave Roosevelt a list of 2,000 Communists in Government way back in 1941, the executive branch of Government had acted as it should, we would not be in trouble in Asia, in Europe or anywhere else on the globe? Has not there been enough disclosure of facts to show plainly that we were betrayed from within time after time? Not just at Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam or the other formal conferences, but day after day in little decision after

decision so that the end result was a policy that surrendered everything the Communists wanted?

The Congress of the United States is not just a lawmaking body. As one of the three branches of Government, it has other functions that our left-wing enemies would have us forget. Congress has the all-important duty of keeping the people informed—of letting them know what's going on behind the scenes in all the other branches. Woodrow Wilson put it most effectively when he said:

"It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. It is meant to be the eyes and voice of its constituents. Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the Government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

The history of the past two decades should dispel all doubts about the wisdom of those words. But yet another man said something in 1936 of even more direct application. Hugo Black, now on the Supreme Court has this to say:

"This power of the probe is one of the most powerful weapons to restrain the activities of groups who can defy every other power. Public investigating committees exist always in countries where people rule. They have always been opposed by groups that seek or have special privileges."

And another in the liberal tradition. Senator George Norris, said:

"Whenever you take away from the legislative body of any country the power of investigation, you have taken a step that will eventually lead into absolute monarchy and destroy any government such as ours."

Now ask yourself another question. What would have been the result if the self-serving denials of wrongdoing that issued from the executive department in the Teapot Dome case had been the end of things? What if the Congress had silently accepted these proclamations of virtue and taken the position it was none of the business of Congress?

Of course even the self-styled liberals of today will not agree that Congress should investigate graft and corruption. Why then do they balk at investigating a subject and a field far more important and dangerous? Why do they constantly attack everyone and every committee engaged in exposing and fighting a conspiracy we all know is dedicated to our destruction as a free people?

I think I know the answer. It's a many-sided one. Of course, some of this opposition is honest even if wrong and based on misinformation or misunderstanding of the true situation. But most of it is definitely inspired by the Communists and their dupes. My friend MARTIN DIES, points out that:

"There were some 10 million gullible people who were enmeshed in the Communist conspiracy. . . . When it suddenly dawned on the country that these organizations were under the control of Moscow these people bitterly resented the exposure. Many of them claimed to be intellectual. . . . A great majority of them turned on the committee with great resentment and began to attack the committee in order to defend themselves."

But some of the people and groups are lined up solidly with the Communists because they want to be on that side. Some of them may honestly think they're in the right but the greatest percentage known better.

You can put all the Communist fronts in the class of those who know the score. Let's look at a few samples.

The Communist Party put out a pamphlet last year entitled "The American Way to Jobs, Peace, Democracy." You may have seen it. On page 14 they say:

"We urge an end to the witch-hunting, the abolition of all congressional witch-hunting committees, and a halt to the Gestapo-like political activities of the FBI. . . . The attempts to outlaw the Communist Party and to deprive Communists of their citizenship rights must be defeated. The Smith and McCarran Acts should be repealed."

Now, let's look at the published platform of a group that has been the loudest in urging the very things I've just cited for you from the Communist document. Americans for Democratic action is the leftwing outfit I mean. They've written and said a great many things on the subject but a few sentences will tell the story. They say:

"We oppose any legislation outlawing any political party. . . . While we recognize the right of Congress to conduct investigations, the House Un-American Activities Committee has proved itself a threat to freedom of political opinion. We, therefore, call for its abolition."

And on the question of the FBI they said something that ought to be long remembered. They defended Judith Coplon and attacked the FBI with these words:

"It has given the public a chance to see how silly an FBI report can really be."

ADA goes right along with the Communist Party in advocating the claimed right of teachers and pupils to be Communists and to do their work without having to bother with loyalty oaths or tests. They grow quite indignant over attacks on teachers who are shown to be Communists or who teach communism. And they say no one should question the right of a Communist to be on the Government payroll.

ADA has long been promoting the idea of "peaceful coexistence" with Red Russia. And they favor our recognizing Red China—and admitting her to the United Nations. These and many other things openly advocated by the Communists are part of the written platforms of ADA.

Yet this outfit parades before the American people as an anti-Communist organization. They depend on the inability of the people generally to learn of the things I've told you today. And so when they launch an all-out attack on my committee or its members it's almost impossible for the public to properly and accurately evaluate their statements. And in this they're helped by such leftwingers as the Alsops, Childs, Stokes, and others.

And while we're about it we should remind ourselves that the same crowd that runs ADA is the moving force in the outfit calling itself the "Committee for an Effective Congress." That's the gang that supplied Senator FLANDERS with his dirt last year. Let's look at some of those doing the planning and plotting for ADA and this "committee."

Now I haven't time for more than a thumbnail outline but here goes. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is probably the most prolific in his writings and propaganda. Well back in 1929 the New York Times published a statement attributed to him in which it is said:

"I happen to believe that the Communist Party should be granted freedom of political action and that Communists should be allowed to teach in universities so long as they do not disqualify themselves by intellectual distortions in the classroom. . . ."

There speaks one who either lacks understanding of the Communist or who is deliberately promoting the cause. I can't believe he is naive. Freedom of political action means freedom to destroy us—nothing

less. Over and over again from Lenin and Marx down to Malenkov they have told us this. I cannot believe anyone with an eighth-grade education could be misled, and teachers and professors do not turn their Communist ideas on and off as they enter or leave a classroom.

Earlier Schlesinger was one of those urging that the deportation order of Harry Bridges be canceled. He was sponsor of a civil rights congress appeal for a meeting to be held at Detroit on April 27 and 28, 1946. This is the organization dedicated to the defense of Communists and which was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General. My committee branded it as controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it (September 2, 1947) and he recently rushed to the defense of J. Robert Oppenheimer in a long magazine article.

I could name other groups with which his name has been associated but I think this enough to give you the idea. Perhaps this will give you some insight into how these groups work and why FLANDERS was used as the front man. And I have checked on some 14 members of the committee for an effective congress as listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year by FLANDERS. I have not had time to run down the records of the balance but I found everyone I checked associated in one way or another with anywhere from 1 to 14 front groups. While one of them, Paul Appleby, has testified before my committee that:

"A man in the employ of the Government has just as much right to be a member of the Communist Party as he has to be a member of the Democratic or Republican Party."

And several others have belonged to Communist fronts, I am not charging them with being Communists. That's something that could only be determined through hearings.

But that's not the point. I'm merely trying to show that people with sympathies of that kind are the ones chiefly responsible for the blatant demand that all investigations into communism be abandoned. These people may honestly believe the stuff they put out but that doesn't change the fact that they are doing for the Communists that which they cannot do themselves. J. Edgar Hoover, whom I admire very much, puts it this way:

"The pseudo-liberal can be more destructive than the known Communist because of the esteem which his cloak of respectability invites."

Which brings to mind the name of another bleeding heart—Robert Hutchins—formerly with the University of Chicago. He has recently blown off steam on this subject as he has been doing for years. When in Los Angeles a little more than a year ago he was extensively quoted as being violently opposed to congressional investigations. He said that Cardinal Spellman was all wrong in saying that no one was being hurt in America by such committees. He said that: "Congressional committees which published lists of subversive Communist and Fascist organizations were run by a bunch of characters. And that the lists should not be published."

He went on to say he didn't believe in loyalty oaths for teachers or professors. And he said:

"I do not feel the Communist Party as dangerous as professed. Some people take it for granted that just because a person is a member of the Communist Party he is dangerous. This is not true."

Is it possible this man is that ignorant? He must know better. But that attitude pretty well sums up the apparent or public thinking of nearly all those who want an end to congressional investigations. It's exactly the same as the Communist Party position. In the pamphlet I mentioned earlier the Communists say:

"Communism is not the issue in this country today or in the near future. . . . American Communists . . . deny that the Soviet Union or any country led and ruled by working people threatens our country, or could threaten our country. . . . But while the issue today is not communism, the true nature of the Communist Party and the role which it plays in American life is very much an issue. The American people must know the truth about this issue lest the monstrous deception now practiced on them lead to the loss of democracy and freedom they prize so dearly."

I presume Hutchins knows these things. Draw your own conclusions as to whether he's promoting the cause of communism when he tries to sell the idea that communism and Communists are really fine and pose no threat to us.

Hutchins and those like him who seek an end to investigations would have us forget the history of the last two decades. No one charges that the whole Democratic Party as such is guilty of condoning all the terrible betrayals that took place. I know many deplore them as strongly as any of us. But I don't see how anyone can avoid agreeing that their leadership did deliberately try to sweep all the dirt under the rug. Surely we have not forgotten that the guilty knowledge about Communists in Government was revealed to both Roosevelt and Truman years before it was brought out into the open by congressional committees.

Let's take the White case as an example, since it's typical. On December 4, 1945, the FBI informed Truman that White was in contact with six persons involved in the Amerasia case. That was some 3 years before our committee hearings. And it was 3 years before our committee exposed Alger Hiss. Yet the FBI had told Truman all about Hiss, Abt, Pressman, Collins, Perlo, Kramer, and others along with White. And about 60 days after the first report the FBI handed up another on the subject.

The first FBI report told of Chambers' statements of 1939. All of this of course long before the famous Pumpkin Papers episode. And Harold Glasser was named. He was an assistant to White. Yet after getting all this information Truman appointed White as United States Director of the International Monetary Fund.

Now observe carefully what this sequence of events means. The FBI did a magnificent job. But it could get no results—except in reverse. When it made known to the President the information it possessed it could go no further. It is part of the executive branch. It has no power to compel action and it is commanded by law to keep its mouth shut. It cannot go to the public as can a congressional committee in an effort to force the President to act. And so in the White case every thing was cozy. Despite the obviously heroic efforts of the FBI to force action the Executive was the boss—and so began the coverup. Nothing happened. The people of the country were entirely in the dark. In the words of Woodrow Wilson, "the country (was) helpless to learn how it (was) being served." The country was in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand.

Is it too much to say that if, instead of covering up, the President had moved swiftly to clean out the nest we could have avoided Korea at the very least? Do you think we would now be debating what we shall do in Asia. Is it not clear that the Nation is now paying the penalty for enforced ignorance of its own affairs? Do you think that Congress would have gone along with the insane things done after these things were privately revealed to the Executive? Rather do you not think that the world would be free of most of the Communist-inspired trouble?

But now observe what happened with passage of time and as a result of the energetic work of my committee. Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers, and others came before the committee and began to unfold the sordid story we now all know. It was done with difficulty for on March 21, 1947, Truman thought to protect himself by issuing his now famous order preventing Congress from getting at the records. Nevertheless, the disclosures broke things wide open with the results we now know. Of course there remains much to be done. The files of the Executive Departments, if opened to the Congress, could tell stories that would dwarf all that's been thus far revealed. I've had a glimpse—I know.

Now does anyone really think that the clean-up, reluctant as it has been, would have been started if the committee had not gone ahead regardless of the brickbats? Truman's famous "red herring" remark was far from the worst thing said about the committee and its work. The Washington Post, the Post Dispatch, the Sun Times, the Los Angeles Daily News and the Pittsburgh Post to name a few took out after the committee in hot pursuit. They practically accused the committee of committing a crime in even examining White in hearing Bentley. Completely without foundation the Post Dispatch said the committee "often shows scant respect for civil rights"—referring especially to the examination of White. Tom Stokes went overboard as usual in these things and said that "White has been a victim of a special sort of tyranny." He said the hearing was an, "American-style inquisition." And that prominent lady who is always quick to jump to the defense of anyone called before a congressional committee, Mrs. Roosevelt, pulled out the favorite of the Communists, character assassination, and called Miss Bentley, "this evidently neurotic lady."

Now I hope you will bear these things in mind when you read or hear these papers, columnists, and others bearing down on congressional investigations. I could cite many more examples of how they operate—and show how they have consistently been wrong. I remind you of just one more example—Alger Hiss.

I think it self-evident that those who constantly cry out, "Let the FBI do it," really mean something far different. The record shows plainly that the FBI can't do it unless those at the top are wholly in sympathy. And even then there is much the FBI cannot do or is prohibited from doing. Above all it is the duty of the legislative branch to exercise its watchdog and informative functions.

Of course it's absurd to say that the Executive Department should be depended on to handle its own checkup and inspection. It's grown to such size that no one man can even know the limits of its domain. And you can depend on it that each man looks out for himself and doesn't seek trouble. It's sheer folly to argue that Congress should leave the policing job to those whose house is to be inspected. That's been the policy of the past—and it's responsible for the situation we now know about. The FBI and the many other security agencies are all part of the executive branch. That branch must always be suspect if we are to preserve our liberty for that's the only branch where real tyranny can arise.

But now I come to a very real and important reason why congressional committees are to be preferred over the FBI or any of the other executive department agencies. The FBI cannot even touch the thing that's most important of all—the factor of political or other influence on policy and decision. Only a congressional committee can lay bare the facts about an outfit like the Institute of Pacific Relations

or any one of the more than 1,200 Communist fronts now operating within our borders. The FBI can act only in criminal matters. Even then it cannot speak out. It cannot subpoena witnesses. It can never expose the secret workings and influence of the men and groups that seek to betray us from within.

We're in trouble all over the globe today, because the evil influence of men who could not be prosecuted for a crime, reached into the high councils of government and produced a Yalta, a Potsdam, a Tehran. We're in trouble, because congressional committees were denied access to files and information before and while things were happening. We learn too late something of the baneful influences that sold Chiang down the river and lost China, Korea, Indochina, central Europe, and now threatening even greater losses unless we're prepared to make a last-ditch fight.

And don't make the fatal mistake of thinking it won't ever happen again, so long as the instinct of self-preservation exists, men in government will always cover up. The man at the top will never know; he can't unless Congress moves in. And since the Communists work 24 hours each day, the pressures will never cease. Congress should be on guard every day of the year if we are to be saved.

There has been much said about committee methods and procedure. Practically all of this started with the left-wing ADA crowd after prompting by the Communists. You have only to attend committee hearings to find that witnesses are not abused. All this talk about civil rights started with the Communist Party's handbook. It's been taken up by people who either do not know the facts or are willfully helping the Communist cause. It's the committee that's on the receiving end. The Communist witnesses are instructed on how to use their appearance as a means of putting over the party line. They are told to "bring out the class issues at the trial." And in answering questions they are instructed to "either answer your own way or not at all."

Those who accuse the committees of destroying civil rights never become specific. They cannot. Instead they set up a straw man to demolish. It's too bad they never sit in on our hearings. But then that would ruin their story.

Now, earlier I said something about Members of Congress being taken in by the Communist conspiracy. Let me give you just a few examples. The American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born was long ago stamped a Communist front. It is perhaps the oldest and best known of the lot. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship has been identified as a front also. These facts have been common knowledge for a long time. Yet despite these well-known facts, several Senators have taken part in or lent their names to the activities of both these groups. Of course, each one can point to the others and use that as an excuse for being duped. But that's no real excuse. A moment's investigation would have revealed the true nature of these groups. The fact that these men did not use the simple precaution of investigating ought to be a warning to others, and certainly argues for the necessity of investigating committees of Congress.

One Senator supported a number of groups, including one of the most important Communist fronts while it lived—the American Youth Congress. That Senator has been listed as a member of the National Advisory Board of the American Friends of the Chinese people and as a sponsor of the American Investors' Union. Both were known Communist fronts. The first of these groups openly espoused the cause of the Chinese Communists. This Senator may say he didn't know these things, but in the face of known facts that would be hard to believe.

And his record as an ADA member belies any such defense.

Several others were affiliated in one way or another with the independent citizens' committee of the arts, sciences, and professions. The Communist Party started that outfit. It has now been succeeded by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Both have been exposed by the committee of which I was a member.

But why go on? This should give you some idea of what I mean when I say that the Communists have reached up into the Congress itself with their influence. I'm not calling these men Communists, but the use of their name and influence with their consent has undoubtedly given aid and comfort to the very ones these men should be fighting. It may have been unconscious, but that does not change things for America. And does it not prove J. Edgar Hoover right when he said:

"The pseudo-liberal can be more destructive than the known Communist, because of the esteem which his cloak of respectability invites."

The really frightening thing about all this is that it evidences a complete lack of understanding of what's going on in the world, and what the Communist conspiracy is doing and how it operates. It's obvious that these men do not yet understand that this Nation has been at war with communism since its birth in Russia in 1917. Of course, the real war against us started in a big way when Roosevelt made the greatest blunder of all—the recognition of Red Russia in 1933. It's been all-out war since that day. These men and many others do not understand that this is a war to the death; that the basic philosophy of the Communist world is that we must be destroyed. And that we must be first softened up from within by the very front method I've discussed.

Over 20 years ago those attending the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow were told:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Earlier Lenin had outlined the general plan of attack. It's passing strange that more people do not understand. Yet, as we know, Hitler's plans were laid out for all to see, but practically no one read or believed. Well, back in 1922, Lenin had this to say:

"First we will take eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack; it will fall like overripe fruit in our hands. We must secure the good will of teachers and professors in schools and universities, of liberal ministers of religion, and of the pacifists and reformers of the world in order to create a mental barrage in the minds of capitalistic youth, which shall forever bar them from participating in a carnal conflict with the Communist order."

Have not the past two decades brought us proof that these words were not idle ones? Is there anyone so blind as to not see that the Communist timetable has been followed right down to the present. Have they not used the means and methods they so plainly told us they intended using? Is there reason to doubt that they intend plowing straight ahead on the furrow they've been following?

Congressional investigating committees are part of the frontline troops in this very real

war between godless communism and those of us who still believe in Christianity and individual freedom. We are the only important organized group combating the subversive influences that seek to lure us to our doom. It's part of the duty of such committees to see to it that the Nation is not lulled to sleep. It's part of the committee job to see to it that the Communist conspirators are not allowed the luxury of surprising us. I am in complete agreement with Woodrow Wilson when he says that the informative function is to be preferred above the legislative one. I agree with Justice Black and Senator Norris in their appraisal of what can be expected if investigating committees are ended.

Those who would destroy the investigating committees looking into the Communist threat have scant knowledge of history. If our liberty is to be preserved, it will be because the elected representatives of the people make it their business to protect it. The eyes and ears of Congress are its committees. The Communists know this. Events of the last year should warn us that they have sucked in far too many to do their bidding. If Congress should now suddenly decide to call off the hunt for subversives there would be great rejoicing in Moscow, for that's their No. 1 goal at the moment. Let's not be suckers.

I am convinced that the concerted efforts the Communists made against all of us on these committees was but part of their overall plan to put out the eyes of the Nation so that, blinded, we will walk over the cliff into totalitarian slavery. You have their word for it that they're counting on us to do this.

I am now temporarily on the sidelines, so to speak, but my interest has not flagged. So long as the Stevenson, Reuther, ADA, left-wing philosophy retains control of the Democratic Party machinery—so long as they put up candidates who subscribe to the theory that we have nothing to fear from the Communists within our midst—the hope of the Nation must rest on the Republican Party and those real Jeffersonian Democrats who have not forgotten their heritage. God forbid that we go soft. If we do, the cause is lost forever.

DEFENSE SKILLS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to revise and extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an excellent statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 1 by my friend, Mr. Henry S. Woodbridge, vice president of the American Optical Co. of Southbridge, Mass.

Mr. Woodbridge, an outstanding industrial statesman and an outstanding authority on the very vital question of preserving skills in American industry, has ably presented views which should be carefully considered by every Member of the Congress.

Foreign imports are unquestionably adversely affecting and dangerously threatening to diminish, certain essential skills in American industry. We must all be concerned lest current trends developing still further should reduce these skills to the danger point and leave our economy severely handicapped regarding defense preparations and its

total-war potential. This thoughtful, well-reasoned, documented presentation by Mr. Woodbridge is most assuredly a great contribution to a most important subject. It is timely and convincing. It points up a most alarming condition.

We should all ask ourselves the question: If we permit foreign competition to reduce still further the utilization and development of the skills of precision workers, and other key workers, so essential to modern, scientific, industrial techniques, how can we possibly be assured of keeping our great industrial machinery and great productive system at that high pitch of efficiency and productivity necessitated by present conditions in the world?

Can we stand by, unprotesting and inactive, while low-standard, low production cost, foreign products take over increasing areas of our markets in respect to fabricated commodities requiring special skills and technical proficiency, and thus leave our economy floundering in confusion and inadequacy when a real emergency arises? This question imperatively requires the careful attention of the Congress. It must be answered, if the national security is to be adequately safeguarded.

DON'T SCRAP DEFENSE SKILLS, WOODBRIDGE URGES

Scrapping of defense-vital skills is far more serious than scrapping guns or planes.

So declared Henry S. Woodbridge, vice president of the American Optical Co., today in urging amendment of the administration's reciprocal-trade bill. Mr. Woodbridge testified before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Twelve years' experience with military procurement had convinced him, Mr. Woodbridge said, "That there is no single responsible authority to make effective the preservation of skills that are essential to our national security."

"This is the Achilles' heel of our defense program," he added. "Failure to make provisions for the preservation of vital skills is nothing short of disarmament. In the final analysis, scrapping of skills is far more serious than scrapping guns or planes. Unlike ships, these skills cannot be mothballed."

"Without certain vital skills our country could find itself at a serious military disadvantage in a time of emergency."

The amendment Mr. Woodbridge suggested would require the Tariff Commission, in any escape-clause proceeding found to involve national security, to report this finding to the Defense Mobilization Board for investigation of defense-essential skills involved. The Board would then submit its findings to the President for appropriate action to preserve them.

Mr. Woodbridge, whose company was founded in 1833 and is the oldest optical company in the country, was strongly opposed to Government subsidies to keep optical skills alive, even though he imagined "our company would have to be included in a subsidization program."

"Frankly, it is our genuine belief that subsidies will weaken the industry and that the right way to handle the situation is in a competitive climate," he added.

"This has always provided the incentives which have resulted in the extraordinary achievements of American industries."

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the next

2 weeks, on such days as there is no legislation being considered under the 5-minute rule, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POSTAL SERVICE COMPENSATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it seems that request has been made by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to bring up the bill H. R. 4644 under suspension of the rules. As one of the members of the committee who tried to report out a fair compromise bill, it is rather shocking to me that that request should be made because we will be unable under the suspension procedure to correct the bill sufficiently to make it practical for all the people involved.

The bill originally called for a 5-percent increase, and a total average of 6.5 percent of payroll. As the bill stands right now, that claim of 7.5 percent is not so. It is only 6 percent for the majority of the postal employees. The increases in the bill range from 6 percent to as high as 58 percent. I have no objection to the 58-percent increase to certain employees for the very reason that the across-the-board increases in the past have destroyed the differences in the salaries. However, under the suspension of the rules procedure it is impossible for us to correct some of the inequities that have shown up. We have tried time and again to correct these things in the committee but have been unable to. For that reason, I believe we should beat down the suspension of the rules on Monday. Let us work out a proper bill on the House floor.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not true that in the bill which will be considered here, should the House vote it under suspension of the rules, we provided at least 15 of the 50 key positions defined in the bill for increases in salaries ranging from 10 to 34 percent?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not also true that in the proposed salary level 5, where 60 percent of the total field service of the postal establishment will be placed, there is an average increase of 6.9 percent?

Mr. LESINSKI. The average increase is correct, but, as I understand it, at the present time the average for the majority

of the employees is below that. It is 6 percent.

Mr. MOSS. I was liberally construing the figures that had been computed by some of those favoring the bill, but putting the most favorable light on it 6.84 percent would represent, I believe, the correct average for that level.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman from California will recall we tried to amend the bill with a compromise of 8 percent, because the actual needs of the employees are 12.5 percent, and they compromised to 10 percent. We tried to get some definite amount that would be a further compromise. Actually the administration has not moved a single bit. We have moved all the way.

Mr. MOSS. There have been many stories published since the committee reported out the legislation, stories which claim that this is a 7.5-percent salary increase bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is not true.

Mr. MOSS. Relating that to the payroll, I believe it represents the cost of the legislation, but it is admitted by the Post Office Department that at least 1.5 percent of the total cost of this legislation is directed primarily to reclassification itself.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MOSS. Therefore, for the purpose of salary adjustment and to meet competitive conditions and to compensate for increased productivity on the part of the worker, and to recognize increased living costs, and I think the Congress should be concerned also with the increased standards of living, there is actually under the legislation only a 6 percent of payroll allotted for that purpose.

Mr. LESINSKI. Under this bill, the Postmaster General has the authority to either upgrade or downgrade a person in the post office. Of course, there is the chance that that might happen to a man because he combs his hair on the wrong side or for some other reason. We realize that there are political purposes, too, but the intent of the bill is that the Postmaster General shall have that authority. I do not think that is proper. It is up to the Congress to regulate such things and to provide a proper piece of legislation so that the employees in the Post Office Department may have a chance to come back to us in case something is wrong.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is it not a fact that those of us who want to see some legislation passed providing a raise for postal employees and all Government employees are being forced into the position of voting against suspension of the rules on next Monday?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct in spite of the fact that generally the bill provides for 6 percent. The majority of the Congress believe a 10-percent increase is proper. Those of us who will vote against the suspension of the rules on Monday will do so not because we do not want an increase, but because we are against the bill as it stands today.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right and this is just another way to get them the raise that they deserve at the present time.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I do not quite follow the logic of the gentleman. Assuming that the bill is not satisfactory in its present form, would it not be better to pass it and send it to conference and let the conferees work out a bill rather than to repeat what happened last year? Of course, you know that the committee of the other body has reported quite a different bill without any reclassification providing a 10-percent raise. The gentleman knows that a great deal of legislation is worked out in conference.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. DIES. What possible service can you render the postal employees by killing this bill and delaying this matter and having a repetition of what you had last year?

Mr. LESINSKI. May I say for the benefit of the gentleman, No. 1, the House bill provides, as it stands now, 6 percent for the majority of the employees; and, No. 2, the second feature of the bill is that there are items of reclassification, which are objectionable. That is the main reason why we are opposing this bill at this time.

Mr. DIES. Assuming that all to be true and assuming the gentleman is correct, as a matter of procedure and as a matter of being practical, would it not be advisable to send this to conference and let the conferees work out a bill? You know that the conferees of the other body are favorable—more favorable, we will assume, to that. If you really want legislation, is that not the practical way to get it?

Mr. LESINSKI. In reply to the gentleman, I will say this, it is up to the House and the membership of the House to decide what kind of legislation we want. If the legislation differs from what the other body puts out, then it should be straightened out the way the gentleman has just said, and that is in conference.

Mr. DIES. But you know what will happen if you kill this bill on Monday.

Mr. LESINSKI. We do not intend to kill the bill, may I say to the gentleman from Texas, because if we cannot do what we would like to do here, we intend to send the bill back to the committee and report out the bill, S. 1, which calls for a 10-percent increase if possible.

Mr. DIES. But you have been working on the legislation now for a long time and you came out with a bill, which is the best bill that you can report; is that not correct?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is right—in the committee, but not on the House floor.

Mr. DIES. Now you propose, after having brought the bill out, that everyone should vote against suspending the rules on Monday for considering the bill, which has the effect of sending the bill back to your committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we followed the reasoning of our friend, the gentleman from Texas, then there would be no reason why we should legislate on any bill, which passes the other body

and we might just as well have the House abdicate its responsibility by saying that we can send the bill to conference to be worked out. Certainly, we have a right to pass on legislation.

The method suggested by the gentleman would deny Members of the House an opportunity for offering amendments and the House passing upon them.

In the second place, if the suspension is not carried, the bill is not defeated. It is in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIES. Yes; and the gentleman knows it will come back with the same sort of gag rule we have had here on all controversial legislation.

Mr. LESINSKI. This is an administration bill, not a bill from the committee.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not true that the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] would place the House in the position of abdicating its responsibility to try to work its will in perfecting legislation which I think is generally agreed by everyone to be necessary.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MOSS. There is a distinct possibility that through offering amendments on this floor, amendments which the House can consider, that we can strengthen certain of the provisions of the bill as they relate to the broad grant of classification of authority which is being given the Postmaster General? For example, the minority views express the intention of those who subscribe to them to offer one amendment which would require the Civil Service Commission, as it does for all other departments of the Government, to audit and review the classification decisions taken by the Postmaster General. It would be a hedge against arbitrary action by the Postmaster General. It is the fear of arbitrary action from the present occupant of that office that has so disturbed the postal organization. They would feel much more secure if they knew that some fairly neutral agency of Government would be accorded the opportunity of reviewing the decisions, allocating them jobs and salary levels. In addition, we will have an opportunity to bring a salary increase for the great bulk of the employees more nearly in line with the salary increases proposed for approximately 18 of the 21 salary levels in this new legislation. Those are decisions which this House should make and which they cannot consider at all under the gag procedure of suspension which, at best, permits us opportunity for most limited discussion. There is not even an opportunity to move to recommit the bill with instructions, under such procedure.

Mr. LESINSKI. The bill presented under suspension, if it is given proper study and if the committee allows it to be corrected properly, is all right, but this bill was not properly considered. True, the Department claims they spent 6 months on it. They could have done so. But the Department did not go to the people that it is supposed to represent, except in a few minor instances. Actu-

ally, in your State you have men in the airmail department that were not even considered or spoken to. In spite of some of the good features of the bill, which I have to acknowledge, basically the bill allows the Postmaster General to demote or to promote or to increase the salaries all the way down the line. I believe you and I in this House, and not the Postmaster General, should have that responsibility.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I am delighted to hear some of my colleagues speak against a closed rule. I wish they had taken that position in the past few weeks when we fought certain closed rules that were passed. But the point I am making is that you have considered this matter for more than a year and you finally came out with a bill, and that represents the very best bill that your committee can formulate. Now you have an opportunity to have that bill considered on the floor of the House.

Assuming that it does not represent what it ought to represent, nevertheless you know and I know that if a committee of the other body that has very liberal ideas with respect to the postal raise and this idea of reclassification, brought out a bill and the other body passed it, it would seem to me that the most practical course would be to pass this bill, let the two bills go to conference and let the conferees try to work out a compromise.

Mr. LESINSKI. In all fairness to the gentleman, he said that we have had a year. That is not so. If the gentleman will recall, last year the bill required the Post Office Department to make a reclassification. That bill did not pass. True, the Post Office Department worked for 6 months on this bill without too much thought given to the employees.

The gentleman said that we were allowed time to study this thing. That is not true, because within a week after it was placed in the hopper the bill was called up for action in the committee and the Members did not have time to study all the provisions of the bill.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the eloquent senior gentleman from Texas but methinks that he contradicts his own policy. I did not have a year to study this bill; I just got here in January. All I know is that the postal employees want a 10-percent raise and I am with them. I sat in on this committee and I am convinced it is not the best bill this committee can report out. I am convinced that the minority report is perhaps to my mind a better proposition, better than even the 10-percent bill of the Senate.

We should have an opportunity to meet this matter on its merits.

I listened to the eloquent gentleman from Texas when he was arguing. He wants an open rule on all matters in which he is interested. Now I find that he uses his seniority and his skill to prevent an open debate.

Mr. DIES. No, the gentleman does not do me justice.

Mr. TUMULTY. May I finish, please? I now find out, listening to his guile of seniority that his method would permit him to take a double position. He could say to the postal employee that he was for them, then the conferees could accomplish just the opposite thing and keep their raises down, a very clever and excellent maneuver. But it seems to me these employees are entitled to have this measure heard in open debate on the floor. I know I am only a freshman and have not had the experience of the gentleman on these various committees in working up these various things. All I know is he stands here and argues against an open rule, that he wants a suspension of the rules. But the people are entitled to have the measure brought up and freely discussed. And I am sure the way to bring out a measure that will do justice to the postal employees is to vote against a suspension of the rules.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman's name was mentioned; I yield to him.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman unduly compliments me. I am not nearly as clever as he thinks. I did not say I was for a closed rule. I said you have a choice between two closed rules, either a suspension of the rules; or if it goes to the Rules Committee you will come back with the same kind of rule that this House has voted on every controversial question as long as I have been here this session. You wanted a closed rule on the various bills where it has been controversial.

Mr. TUMULTY. I think the gentleman mistakes my position.

Mr. DIES. I did not mean the gentleman individually.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do not look at me then if you do not mean me; look at somebody else.

Mr. DIES. If you have any assurance that you could come back here with an open rule under which this bill could be amended that would be one thing; but, as a practical matter, you and I know that if you defeat this suspension method, and then go to the Rules Committee, you will come back with the same sort of situation in which you cannot offer amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, my good friend from Texas has not, I think, said he was going to vote for suspension. I say that in justice to the gentleman. I understood he was just probing for enlightenment for himself as well as for the other Members, and I am sure the gentleman's mind is still open as to whether or not he will vote for suspension on Monday. As I understood my friend, he was just viewing things from a practical angle, in this case a little bit too practical for me to follow. But he has not stated he was going to vote for suspension of the rules. I am sure he will keep his mind open. The practical effect of that will be that we are denying an opportunity on a bill that there should not be a closed rule on.

There are some bills we recognize there should be some closed rules on. I am sure that my friend from Texas on the tax bill would want to vote for a closed rule rather than having an amendment offered in relation to a depletion allowance for oil, for example. I am sure my friend would vote for a closed rule, so would I on a tax bill, but not for that reason. I realize that in connection with oil there should be an allowance for depletion. I have rather definite views that do not vary very much from those of my friend from Texas. I am sure if he were faced with the possibility of an amendment being offered to a tax bill which would sharply reduce the depletion allowance on oil he would vote for a closed rule.

There are certain bills we have closed rules on. The procedure for Monday is a proper procedure. It is under the rules of the House, and no criticism can be directed. I am opposed to it because I do not think in connection with this particular bill that should be exercised. I think an opportunity, a reasonable opportunity, should be given to the membership of the House to try and carry out the will of the House. I am sure that if the bill were brought up under the general rules of the House there would be only two amendments offered to it.

There are different kinds of closed rules. There is an absolute closed rule. However, a closed rule never takes away the right of offering a motion to recommit. Then there is also the partially closed rule. There are closed rules which permit certain amendments to be offered in the Committee of the Whole. So that I am sure if suspension of the rules does not prevail on Monday this bill will be brought up before the House in the reasonably near future.

Mr. LESINSKI. I was one of the first of the committee who wanted to bring about the formulation of a practical balance between both sides. If this bill met even to a degree what I tried to propose originally, I would be the first to follow the gentleman from Texas. But, on second thought and for your information, the bill as reported out of the committee is not the bill the committee members voted on originally. It has been changed between the reporting out of the committee of the bill and the final printing of the bill. That is something for us to consider and that is the reason why we are opposing it today.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say this at the present time. The gentleman from Massachusetts has referred to suspensions and to closed rules. Those of us who have been here through the years know that sometimes we have closed rules and many times we have suspensions. Without going into reasons why, certainly not at this time, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows as well as I do why many bills are brought here under suspension of the rules. Here is a situation where a bill has been reported, as I understand it, from the committee that has had the matter under consideration for months and months by a vote of 16

to 7. I think it is liberal treatment of the employees. I think it should also be understood that before suspension of the rules can be had, a request must come from the chairman of the committee who in this instance is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] to the Speaker of the House before suspension can be had.

Now, I assume that is what has been done on this occasion. I think it is fair also for me to say at this juncture that this bill, if it is passed as it is written here, can go on and become law, and that certainly is something that we ought to be interested in, all of us. So, as far as the procedure is concerned, there is nothing irregular about it. Bills of this sort have come up under suspension of the rules before and will come up under suspension of the rules hereafter, as do many other bills, from the Committee on Veterans' Administration, for instance, and even another bill is to be called under suspension of the rules on Monday next.

Mr. LESINSKI. May I say to the gentleman if you had a lot of fourth class post offices in your district and they were to be closed, say, by intimidation, it is rather difficult for you to keep an open mind.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I would like to call the attention of the Members to the fact that we have during this session of Congress acted on two salary bills permitting ample time for the Members of this body to debate them. One of them was our own bill. The other was a salary bill for the military. Now we have another salary proposal dealing with another group of Federal employees. I can see no valid reason why their case must be considered under gag procedures unless there is a fear that, if permitted to work its will, the House would go beyond what the Postmaster General has laid down as an absolutely rigidly imposed ceiling. I am not willing to abdicate my privileges and my responsibilities as a Member of this House to any member of the Cabinet. That is a decision which I should decide on the merits and I should decide it after being thoroughly familiar with all of the facts.

Now, as to the question raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], this bill needs to be perfected before it goes to conference. The other body has reported a bill and will probably pass a bill which contains not a single provision relating to classification. If we are going to have proper classification, then we have the responsibility here in this House to send to conference a bill which is a proper classification act. The matter of salary can be compromised in conference, and I hope that it will be, and I think it is possible, if we take this matter under debate and consider just a few rather important amendments, that we can perfect it to the point where, in conference, a reasonable compromise can be arrived at which all of us can subscribe to.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why every Member of this House or most every Member will at times be in favor of a closed rule, but I can see no justification at this time for suspension of the rules on an important bill like this. A lot has been said about the salary increase, but there is a whole lot more involved in this legislation than the proposal to increase salaries. I refer to what has been called reclassification. Many of us are very much concerned about this reclassification feature. A lot has been said about the crying need for reclassification, but I wonder how many Members know what this reclassification bill does. It seems to me that there should be an opportunity to discuss it fully and put into the record the pros and cons on this important question of reclassification. For that reason, I think it is important that enough Members be present on Monday to defeat the effort to suspend the rules.

The Post Office Department has been very effective in its propaganda campaign for reclassification. In fact, the Department has a propaganda agency which surpasses anything I have ever seen in any government department. I recall some of the harsh criticism that was leveled at heads of some of the agencies during the Truman administration, who were charged with trying to influence legislation. Such charges were even made when the Social Security Administration sent out pamphlets explaining the provisions of the social-security law. Now the critics are strangely silent as hundreds of press releases pour out of the Post Office Department to sell a questionable reclassification bill and to increase first-class postage rates.

Unless one is familiar with both sides of this important reclassification issue, the propaganda from the Department could be most convincing.

A sound reclassification bill should start out by setting a maximum pay and a minimum to make possible the kind of livelihood to which every American citizen is justly entitled. Once the proper minimums and maximums are agreed upon we are in a position to arrive at the proper evaluation of jobs. That has not been done in this bill.

This bill, if passed, will result in greater confusion, more discontent and falling morale in the postal service. The power it places in the hands of the Postmaster General, if used for ulterior purposes, could result in serious consequences to postal employees and the postal service. Perhaps the present head of the Department has no such plan, but the power is there if this bill is enacted. It can be used at any time any Postmaster General wishes to use it.

There are some who may question the right of postal employees to belong to labor organizations. Others may question the right of Federal-employee organizations to press Members of Congress for support of legislation in which they are interested.

Leaders of employee organizations fear that such an attitude is held by some administration leaders.

They are justly concerned about some of the provisions in this bill. Some postal employees from my district have bluntly told me that they would rather have no pay increase than one that carries with it some of the reclassification provisions.

It matters little what kind of a pay bill is passed if postal employees will be put into a position where they can be demoted or promoted at will. They lose all if in order to be secure in their jobs they are forced to conform to the thinking and philosophy of those who control the Post Office Department.

Some of us on the committee had grave misgivings about this bill, but we were willing to compromise in an effort to have some kind of legislation enacted which would give the Department more freedom in dealing with personnel problems and at the same time provide for an adequate pay increase for postal workers. Amendments have been made in committee which resulted in substantial improvement in the legislation as first proposed. But there needs to be opportunity to make further changes which many of us believe are very important.

In the present bill some top bracket employees will receive increases of \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year. In the lower brackets, where the need is greatest, increases will amount to only \$210 a year.

Such a proposal reflects the same kind of economic thinking and philosophy as the trickle-down theory on taxes and other important legislation.

In my opinion, a vote to suspend the rules is a vote for a proposal which can lead only to greater confusion and dissatisfaction in the postal service. Every Member who wants to be fair with the efficient and faithful employees in the postal service and who is concerned about employee morale should vote against suspension when the opportunity comes next Monday.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am a man with a simple mind. I know little and understand less of the legislative ambushes that smart men devise for thwarting the will of the majority. I do know that the postal workers of the United States are underpaid. I do know that the wives and the children of these underpaid postal workers are paying the price of administrative frills and administrative stubbornness. I do know that in the 83d Congress we in this House were given an ultimatum that we would have to take the barbarously unfair bill of the administration or get no bill at all to help these humble postal workers.

I know that we stood firm, and finally the majority of the membership of this House won the day and we passed a bill giving the postal workers a long overdue pay increase. The will of the Postmaster General was of stronger influence with the President of the United States than the voice of the Congress and the President of the United States vetoed the bill. In November the people took matters in their own hands and returned a Democratic Congress.

I am not saying that the mistreatment of the little people who do the underpaid jobs in the Post Office Department was the sole reason why the people sent to Washington a Democratic Congress. I do say it was a factor in the election because the majority of the American people, I am happy to say, are little people. By little people I mean men and women who do well and faithfully their jobs, smilingly trodding the routine of daily toil and wishing in return only the opportunity properly to take care of their families. The great majority of the Members of the House in their hearts sympathize with and want to do the right and decent thing for the little men and women of America.

As I understand it, on Monday next there will be a resort to legislative ambushing to prevent the doing of the decent thing by the postal workers. The challenge to every Member of this House who wants to do the decent thing by the postal workers is to be on this floor on Monday and remain here, untimidated by partisan pressures or by the dictatorial commands from any source, until the battle has been won.

Mr. LESINSKI. I concur with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has expired.

TO AMEND THE RICE MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2839) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to hear a brief explanation of the bill by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the author of the bill, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], is present and I should like to yield to him to make a brief explanation.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to do the same thing for the rice producer as is now done under the statutes for wheat, for peanuts, and for cotton. It would permit the rice farmer to release to the county committee the whole or a part of his allotment that he did not want to plant and have it reallocated in that same county. By releasing, or voluntarily surrendering, this acreage such rice farmer does not lose his acreage history. This legislation would provide some additional acreage to producers who have suffered hardship as a result of the large national reduction of 24.7 percent in the 1955 allotments. It keeps the acreage in the county where

the history was earned in those instances in which a farmer did not wish to plant the particular land and voluntarily surrendered the allotment to be re-allocated to other growers.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1955 crop of rice, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Any part of the farm rice acreage allotment on which rice will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be re-apportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of the past production of rice by the producers on the farm or the past production of rice on the farm, as the case may be; acreage allotments previously established for the farm or for the producers on the farm, as the case may be; abnormal conditions affecting acreage; land, labor, water, and equipment available for the production of rice; crop-rotation practices; and the soil and other physical factors affecting the production of rice. Any allotment surrendered under this provision shall be regarded for the purposes of subsection (b) of this section as having been planted on the farm from which surrendered, except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was surrendered eligible for an allotment as having rice planted thereon, or to make any producer thereon eligible for an allotment as having produced rice, during the 5-year base period."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICE ALLOTMENT HISTORY

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4356) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a brief explanation of this bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in some of our rice producing States, the allotment of acreage is given to the individual farmer rather than to the landowner. It is customary procedure to farm on shares. A man with an allotment will go to a landowner and say, "I want to come in and farm on your property and we will split 50-50." That farmer may have the entire allotment and the landowner no allotment. Under the present law, at the end of the season, the history of that acreage is split 50-50 between the farmer and the landowner, something which will entirely disrupt the industry in those States in which

the acreage and the history customarily goes with the farmer.

This bill was approved and written in the Department of Agriculture, as was the one we have just passed, H. R. 2839.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to subsection (c) thereof the following new paragraph:

"In determining the past production of rice by producers on a farm for the purpose of establishing farm acreage allotments for the 1956 and subsequent crops, the acreage of rice on the farm for any year for which farm acreage allotments were in effect shall be divided among the producers thereon in the proportion in which they contributed to the farm acreage allotment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REES of Kansas.

Mr. RILEY.

Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include a lenten message by the Chaplain of the House, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

Mr. CRAMER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIGGS.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SISK, for Friday, March 18, on account of official business.

Mr. MINSHALL (at the request of Mr. McGREGOR), on account of official business.

Mr. BETTS (at the request of Mr. McGREGOR), on account of official business.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint

resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

560. A letter from the chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the 45th Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1954, pursuant to the act of June 15, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

561. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the annual report of activities for the period ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 6 (c) of the act of July 3, 1930 (Public Law 536, 71st Cong.), and section 1504 of the act of June 22, 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), including the annual report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting the fifth semiannual report of contracts, in excess of \$50,000, for research, development, and experimental purposes for the period July 1 through December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

563. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal pursuant to the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1954 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

564. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the settlement of claims made under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended, during the calendar year 1954, pursuant to section 222c (e) of title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

565. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

566. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

567. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8

U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

568. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

569. A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the Journal of the Senate, Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, special session of 1954, pursuant to section 69 of an act of Congress approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

570. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 14, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 25, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5046. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4941. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4647. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4951. A bill directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 876. A bill for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec; without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 957. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristof, his wife Jordana Diloza Cristof, and his children George and

Daphne-Kremena Christof; with amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser; without amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 970. A bill for the relief of Kyung Ho Park (Syung Sil Park) and his wife, Mrs. Young Sil Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francis Mihalika; without amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:
H. R. 5046. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOGGS:
H. R. 5047. A bill to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:
H. R. 5048. A bill to exempt farm transportation from tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCVEY:
H. R. 5049. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. METCALF:
H. R. 5050. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5051. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHORT:
H. R. 5052. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the punishment of persons transporting and receiving stolen dogs in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H. R. 5053. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to establish an additional wage basis for computing compensation in cases of recurrence of disability and in cases of death occurring subsequent to such recurrence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:
H. R. 5054. A bill to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to July 25, 1957, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):
H. R. 5055. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service Academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5056. A bill to provide greater security for persons retired after service during the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection,

in the granting of outpatient treatment by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:
H. R. 5057. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, and to provide benefits for the wives and minor children of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:
H. R. 5058. A bill to extend service pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the Spanish-American War (including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection), or who served as teamsters with the Army during such war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:
H. R. 5059. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 5060. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended, in reference to the protection of officers and employees of the United States by including probation officers of United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5061. A bill to establish a commission and advisory committee on international rules of judicial procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:
H. R. 5062. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5063. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:
H. R. 5064. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to lower from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 5065. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5066. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" governing the payment of compensation or pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:
H. R. 5067. A bill to amend section 721 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:
H. R. 5068. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 5069. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain Philippine citizens by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:
H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in October of each year as Grandparents' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH: The House of Representatives of the Colorado State Assembly requesting that Congress increase the mileage in the proposed interstate highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that the construction program of the Copper River Highway, now under way on a piecemeal basis, be accelerated to permit development of resources of the region at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Bishara Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Kurt Klein and Erno Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Pasquale De Leonibus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 5073. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Morciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5075. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Forreger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 5076. A bill for the relief of Laura Ann Aylott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Gladys H. (Butts) White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5079. A bill for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5080. A bill for the relief of Florence E. McConnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5081. A bill for the relief of Gan Seow Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Koto Nakagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5083. A bill for the relief of Kyung Cho Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Fred M. Anderson, Frank A. McCart, and William C. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

162. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States at their 31st annual meeting in Atlantic City on March 4, 1955, supporting and endorsing the position of the American Association of State Highway Officials relating to the Federal aid program which is to be enacted by the 84th Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

163. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ole Pearson and Berger Fasdall, Ketchikan, Pulp Co., Hollis Logging Camp, Ketchikan, Alaska, requesting passage of H. R. 2535, a bill to provide statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

164. Also, petition of George Hughes and others, Sitka, Alaska, requesting passage of H. R. 2535, a bill to provide statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

165. Also, petition of M. C. Humphrey and others, Ketchikan, Alaska, requesting passage of H. R. 2535, a bill to provide statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Religion in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a Lenten message from our good Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp. Recently I had the pleasure of having Dr. Braskamp as my guest on a radio program broadcast in my district. Dr. Braskamp commented on the subject of religion in American life, a subject to which millions of Americans today are giving renewed thought and meditation. With a view to making his views available to a wider audience, I include them herewith:

RELIGION IN AMERICAN LIFE

(A statement by the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House of Representatives)

I believe that a resurgence of faith in God, reverence for God's moral order, and obedience to God's will would be the noblest victory in the annals of American history, for our national greatness cannot survive if we allow it to become eclipsed by a decline in spiritual idealism.

Materialism, as a philosophy, has well nigh run its course, but as a habit and way of life it still seems to have a very strong hold on many. The dream of an economic Garden of Eden is a very old one and there are those who feel that all that mankind needs is an abundance of food and drink and clothing and then all will be well. To be sure these are among the necessities of life and every-

thing should be done to improve mankind's temporal conditions.

Man, however, is too great to be content with these, for man cannot live by bread alone. What we need to do is to help America cultivate the religious sentiment with the lofty idealisms, for then only can our Nation make a distinct contribution to the wealth of human aspirations and achievements and fulfill its responsibility for the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

It seems to me that the logic of the American way of life and the religious spirit of our Republic find their noblest expression when as citizens we seek to blend a virile and wholesome type of materialism with a noble and lofty idealism.

Our national spirit, at its best, embraces this dual aspect and these two must always be kept in close and cordial agreement so that our materialism shall incarnate our idealism and the great spiritual realities and sentiments shall pervade and permeate our materialism.

I believe that one of the most encouraging and hopeful signs of our time is just this, that there is a new feeling of God-consciousness among our leaders in public life. I frequently talk with the men in Congress about the place of religion in our national life and I find them very responsive and ready to admit that our national problems cannot be solved on a purely economic basis and that God must be brought into the picture. We are beginning to see that the weakness of our plans and programs for a finer social order has been just this, that we are working on the stupid assumption that an abundance of material things for struggling humanity is the universal cure-all.

The manmade economic order needs to be coordinated with the God-made moral and spiritual order; otherwise there will be chaos and confusion, damnation and doom. Let no one say that the principles of Christianity have failed. The truth of the matter is that neither as a nation or as individuals have

we ever given them an honest-to-goodness trial.

The time has come to put first things first. This is what Jesus said, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." Roger Babson said many years ago, "The solution of the labor problem is wholly a question of religion." A leading commercial journal has said, "Above all else this country needs a nationwide revival of old-fashioned prayer-meeting religion."

Most Holy Trinity Church, Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's observance of St. Patrick's Day had an extra significance for Most Holy Trinity Church located at Sixth and Porter Streets in the 13th Congressional District of Detroit, for the 100th anniversary of its edifice was celebrated. Few parishes in the United States have such a long colorful history in the service of the community and God Almighty. Many priests and sisters formerly connected with the parish returned for the anniversary. Descendants of those who built the church returned from all parts of Detroit. They were greeted by Mexicans, Maltese, Chinese, and other newcomers—today's parishioners of the mother church of Detroit's Irish.

When Bishop Frederic Rese arrived here in 1833 to direct the newly established Detroit diocese, he received a petition from Irish Catholics for a parish and priest of their own. They were then attending St. Anne's Church, where sermons in English were preached for them.

Granting the request of the Irish here, Bishop Rese bought from the First Protestant Society its church, then located on Woodward Avenue between Larned and Congress. He had the frame building moved to Cadillac Square where now stands the Barlum Tower.

Before the building could be remodeled for Catholic services, the dreaded Asiatic cholera broke out and took a heavy toll. There were no hospitals or pesthouses. Bishop Rese ordered the proposed Holy Trinity Church turned into a temporary hospital and put it in charge of Father Martin Kundig. It was the first hospital in this part of the country.

After the plague had abated, on Trinity Sunday in 1835, the first church for the Irish of Detroit was dedicated. In 1849 it was moved to Sixth and Porter in Corktown, the area bounded east and west by Third and Eighth Streets, and south and north by the river and Vernor Highway. In 1855 the early church was razed to make room for the present structure.

The new church cost \$30,000, a great sum for those days. When it was built Detroit had fewer than 25,000 inhabitants, there was no streetcar line, gas lighting was unknown, the eastern boundary of the city was Dequindre Street and the western limits were at Trumbull Avenue.

In the old brick building, thousands of Detroiters, now prominent in civic and religious life, received baptism. Before its main altar hundreds of couples spoke their matrimonial vows and later moved into other parishes. Thousands of Detroiters received their religious and secular education in Holy Trinity Parochial School.

First pastor of Holy Trinity Parish was Father Bernard O'Cavanagh. In a short time he was succeeded by Father Kundig, who had charge a few months. One of the pastors of Old Trinity was the first priest ordained for this diocese, Father Lawrence Kilroy. Msgr. James Savage, known as the dean, served the parish 50 years, 10 years as assistant and 40 years as pastor. He died in 1927.

Successive pastors down through the years, including the present spiritual leader, Father Clement Kern, have been dedicated men whose conception of their responsibility encompassed all facets of community life. Under this conception by its leaders, parish members of Most Holy Trinity Church throughout the years have been principal factors in the growth and changing tone not only of our city of Detroit but, in the far-reaching effect of progressive community interest sensitive to the needs of humanity, they have heavily contributed to national welfare. America's position of world leadership, land of freedom and opportunity and riches, has been the attainment of such rightful conceptions of life and conscientious labors in making them a reality as represented in the efforts of the people of Most Holy Trinity.

It is fitting, therefore, that we here in the Congress of the United States, who recognize and appreciate the major role played by our great churches in fostering these ideals, in establishing these ideals as a bulwark in the struggle against godless international communism, pause and pay special tribute to the people of Most Holy Trinity Church of Detroit.

A Tribute to the Late Senator Maybank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, early on the morning of September 1, 1954, I turned on my radio to get the headline news which is given at that time. I was shocked and distressed to hear that my distinguished senior Senator and beloved friend, Burnet Maybank, had passed away during the night. I felt very deeply that my State and Nation had suffered one of its heaviest losses in years, in the passing of this very able and distinguished representative in the prime of his life. I felt very deeply, too, the great personal loss which had come to me.

While Senator Maybank had been active in the political life of my State and in the leadership of the Democratic Party in South Carolina, I did not know him intimately until I came to Congress during the dark days of World War II. Senator Maybank was even then a leader in the United States Senate, although he had been a Member of that great body less than a term at that time. He was most cooperative in assisting me with matters that came before me and most generous in the giving of his time and counsel in matters in which we were jointly interested. I learned to know him well, and he and I became fast friends working together on legislation affecting our State. We had many joint problems since I had the honor of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee in the House and later on the Appropriations Committee in the House, while Senator Maybank was chairman of the great Banking and Currency Committee in the Senate and served on the Appropriations Committee in the Senate. I can say, with all sincerity, that Senator Maybank gave, without reservation, of his great ability and unbounded energy in the service of his State and Nation. I firmly believe that his life was shortened through his extremely conscientious efforts to cope with the many problems of his responsible position. Beyond a doubt, he was one of the ablest and most influential representatives from South Carolina to serve in the national Congress.

He had a rich background of culture, splendid educational advantages, rare ability, and a personality that won him friends, not only among his Democratic colleagues, but among those who served

on the Republican side. He had the confidence of all of his associates.

He had the confidence and esteem of the people of South Carolina, for he had filled with distinction the many responsible assignments which the citizens of his home city of Charleston and his beloved State had given him. The affection, confidence, and esteem in which he was held is attested by the fact that he was never defeated for any office for which he offered, and by the fact that in his last race for reelection as United States Senator he was unopposed, a tribute accorded to no other candidate for the national Senate by the people of the Palmetto State.

He loved his family, and nothing gave him greater pleasure than to have his friends visit with him and his family. My deepest sympathy goes to these loved ones of his. They have suffered an irreparable loss, but they have the great heritage of a noble husband and father to comfort them in the passing of this true southern gentleman and outstanding statesman. Those of us who are left can but try to emulate the high ideals and principles which guided the life of Burnet Rhett Maybank.

The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will consider, under suspension of the rules, the bill H. R. 4644, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

Because of the limited time, under such procedure, I am presenting here for the information of the Members a few facts concerning this legislation.

Our committee has worked diligently to develop legislation which would not only be fair and equitable to postal employees, but would also come reasonably within the bounds of the President's request for this legislation.

Our committee has recommended a good bill. I am sure the Members when in possession of all the facts will agree. The members of the committee are to be commended for the effort they have put forth and the results obtained. This extends not only to those who voted with the large majority of the committee, but also to those who have some slight reservations with respect to the ultimate product.

Basically, the bill provides a minimum of 6-percent salary increase, and, at the same time, will bring about a reclassification of postal employees' salaries through the establishment of a new salary plan for the postal field service.

Under the bill, 90 percent of the employees are covered by position specifically defined in the bill and are assigned to appropriate salary levels. Only 10 percent will be assigned by the Post-

master General, and these must be assigned in accordance with strict standards and subject to an appeal to the Civil Service Commission by the employee concerned.

Many Members have received letters expressing concern about certain provisions or lack of them in the bill as originally recommended by the Postmaster General, H. R. 2987. The committee, by its action, has eliminated virtually everyone of these objections. Even the views of the minority are only one-half of 1 percent apart on total amount of the increase. For the benefit of the Members there follows a discussion of the most frequently raised objections to the bill, coupled with corrective action taken by the committee. For the convenience of the Members, I have referred to appropriate section numbers in H. R. 4644.

1. THE POSTMASTER GENERAL HAS TOO MUCH AUTHORITY TO GRADE JOBS

While this was not entirely true, the committee recognized the concern of the employees and struck out references to Postmaster General and rephrased the language to make the provisions of the bill a matter of law rather than to be dependent on actions required of the Postmaster General.

The descriptions of duties, responsibilities, and relationships of 50 positions, covering more than 90 percent of the postal employees, and the establishment of salary levels, are made a matter of law by section 203 of the bill.

The detailed procedure for the establishment of salary levels for the remaining less than 10 percent are made a matter of law by section 201 of the bill.

Section 202 authorizes the employee to appeal to the Civil Service Commission any action taken by the Post Office Department in the assignment of a job to a key position or to a salary level. It also makes the decisions of the Civil Service Commission mandatory on the Postmaster General.

2. THE SALARY OF AN EMPLOYEE CAN BE REDUCED MERELY BY ASSIGNMENT TO LOWER DUTIES

The committee, in the language of section 204, allows the assignment of employees to other duties but provides (a) that the salary of no employee be reduced as a result of such action, and (b) that assignment of an employee to higher duties for more than 30 days in a calendar year shall be paid for at the higher rate of pay.

3. ALLOWS THE POSTMASTER GENERAL TO MAKE UNLIMITED APPOINTMENTS TO SUPERVISORY POSITIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Section 501 limits this authority to appointment of persons who have been civilian employees in any branch of the Government and to positions in the regional and district offices and positions in the professional and scientific fields.

4. PERMITS THE APPOINTMENT OF AN UNLIMITED NUMBER OF SUBSTITUTES

The committee recognized that there was some desirability of eliminating the regular-substitute ratio in the interest of flexibility of administration. However, it also felt that the claims that no ratio would lead to abuses had merit. Section 606 (c) retains a ratio but

changes it from 6 regulars to 1 substitute to 5 to 1. This overcomes the objections of the employees. It also allows additional administrative flexibility.

5. THE PROPOSAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION WOULD ALLOW THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT TO DOWNGRADE ALL POSITIONS

Sections 201, 202, 203, 301, 302, 303, and 504 of H. R. 4644 establishes by law the grade and salary of over 90 percent of the positions and provides a mandatory procedure for establishing the salary level of all others.

6. PROVIDES GREATEST INCREASES FOR HIGHER PAID WORKERS

This statement would be true, if the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and responsibility is to be ignored. The ranking of positions and salary levels as set forth in titles II and III of the bill, H. R. 4644, recognizes this principle. There are some 1,100 employees in positions such as assistant postmasters, superintendents of mails, superintendent of transportation, and a few others who for some 10 years have been grossly underpaid. For instance, the Postmaster at New York is paid \$13,770 while the Assistant Postmaster is paid only \$8,470. This is a difference of \$5,300 between the postmaster and his first deputy. The provisions of H. R. 4644 will bring these salary rates into more reasonable alignment and will, for the first time, recognize the duties and responsibilities of the assistant postmaster.

The committee also recognized that the clerks and carriers in post offices in the first and second class have greater responsibilities than reflected in the salary level proposal by the administration. A new salary level 5—section 301—which provides higher salaries for these groups of employees was approved by the committee. The additional cost resulting from the insertion of this new level is estimated at over \$20 million.

7. THE PROPOSED EFFECTIVE DATES DELAY THE INCREASES FOR 6 MONTHS.

Section 710 (c) of H. R. 4644 establishes the first pay period after date of enactment as the effective date of both the 6-percent minimum pay increase and that resulting from reclassification. The bill allows a maximum of 180 days in which to effect the assignment of all positions to salary levels. Once the assignment is made, the employee will receive a retroactive payment for the amount of his gross increase as of the first pay period after date of enactment of this bill.

Use of Draft To Force Compliance With Farm Programs Is Unethical, Un-American, and Probably Illegal

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives repealed

the so-called tie-in provision of the 1953 agriculture law, under which farmers who failed to comply with crop controls were ineligible to participate in the ACP program.

This was a wise move, for the Congress obviously felt that programs having separate and distinct goals should not be tied together.

It has come to my attention, however, that local selective-service boards are being advised to base agricultural deferments on compliance with crop controls established by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

Memoranda have been circulated among local boards in Pennsylvania setting forth benchmarks for use in reducing farm deferments. I quote two of these benchmarks:

3. Attention should be centered on the kind of farm produce and whether or not the farm in question is adhering to acreage quota of crops demanded by the Department of Agriculture.

And then the following:

Credit should be given only for farm commodities marketed. Therefore, for example, if a farmer is feeding 100 percent of his field crops or other produce to his stock he should be given credit for the milk or stock sold and not for the crops fed to produce that milk or other livestock. Further, any percentage of crops fed should be deducted from the unit value of crops sold.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize selective service as a necessary evil at best; a burden we Americans must reluctantly assume because of the existing world tensions. No one in this body who supported the extension voted earlier this year did so, I am confident, with the intent that it should be used to help Secretary Benson enforce compliance with his crop-control program.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a portion of a memorandum dated February 1, which has been forwarded to local boards in Pennsylvania.

This purports to provide answers to frequently asked questions. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a most flippant, a most sophomoric approach to an extremely serious problem. Seldom have I had the opportunity of reading anything more ridiculous than this memorandum.

The memorandum follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STATE
HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Harrisburg, Pa., February 1, 1955.

MEMORANDUM TO ALL LOCAL BOARDS

Subject: Notes on agriculture

There follows a few answers to excuses given to the question, Can a registrant be replaced? If not, why?

Excuse. It would take years of training.

Answer. He has been liable since he registered and the training should have been started some time ago.

Excuse. Registrant is not replaceable. (Registrant is the son.)

Answer. No son is replaceable. But he is still liable for service.

Excuse. Where can you get hired help to do what the owner will do?

Answer. Nowhere. But owner is keyman and he can train and supervise a replacement.

Excuse. Not dependable.

Answer. A good many people are this way in other pursuits as well as agricultural. No excuse.

Excuse. Cannot pay off debt and wages at same time.

Answer. Neither can the businessman, but he is liable for service.

Excuse. Because it wasn't necessary.

Answer. Wrong. It is necessary.

Excuse. Doing all right this way.

Answer. So were we all until the lightning struck.

Excuse. Who will work on farm from daylight to dark?

Answer. Better wages and living conditions would help to persuade someone to do this.

Excuse. Because I own farm business and tools.

Answer. So does the business and the professional man own his own business and tools.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker—

We invoke holy Patrick, Ireland's chief apostle.

Glorious is his wondrous name, a flame that baptized heathen;

He warned against hard-hearted wizards.

He thrust down the proud with the help of our Lord of fair Heaven.

He purified Ireland's meadow-lands, a mighty birth.

We pray to Patrick chief apostle; his judgment hath delivered us in doom from the malevolence of dark devils.

God be with us, together with the prayer of Patrick, chief apostle.

So prayed Ninine, Irish poet of the eighth century or earlier, and so we pray today. There is a green-and-gold glory about the world today, the sunshine on the grass reminding us of the dearly loved flag of ancient Ireland—the golden harp on a green field. All the year round we love the Irish, but this is the day we stand up and tell them so. This is the day when Irish song and Irish poetry mingle with flights of impassioned prose by orators of every race, all over the world. Everyone who feels the springs of courage in him, or claims to have a sense of humor, feels that he has a bit of the Irish in his blood.

All our hearts re-echo today to the music of these lines of William Drennan: When Eire first rose from the dark-swelling flood, God blessed the green island, and saw it was good; The emerald of Europe, it sparkled and shone, In the ring of the world, the most precious stone. In her sun, in her soil, in her station thrice blest, With her back towards Britain, her face to the west, Eire stands proudly insular, on her steep shore, And strikes her high harp 'mid the ocean's deep roar.

All over the length and breadth of America people are wearing green—a shamrock, a green necktie, green suits

and dresses. I have little doubt that some, in their unrestrained enthusiasm, are leaping this minute into vats of green dye. More power to them. May they live into a green old age.

We of Polish ancestry, you know, have a special feeling of kinship with the Irish. Poland, like Ireland, has a tragic and glorious history of bravery, of war and betrayal, of glorious victories and devastating defeats. But they are alike most of all in the courage that holds on to national identity and patriotism, through years and centuries of foreign rule; and in the faith that no promise of reward or threat of punishment can shake. It is out of defeat that we, Polish and Irish and American, draw our most glorious memories. Warsaw in World War II, with its history of oppression and murder, climaxed by the betrayal of General Bor and his gallant band of partisans, is a name to go down in history with Drogheda, of Cromwell's invasion of Ireland, and with the Alamo. But this background of gallantry and stalwart faith has a sadness about it that is foreign to the enjoyment of this day. Let us think, rather, of the double symbolism of the color green—the color of Ireland and the color of hope. Ireland, under the patronage of St. Patrick, won through to its independent place in the family of nations, after centuries of suffering and hoping, and to the unhampered exercise of the Catholic religion. May the green of hope and of St. Patrick carry today to every Polish heart assurance that Poland, too, will attain freedom and independence.

Today, though, the first thought of every Pole, and of every American, goes out to Ireland, whose sons are brave, whose daughters beautiful. Our hearts dance to the lilt of Irish melody and verse, until we half feel our own fathers and mothers must have been Irish, and we can read, with a feeling almost of nostalgia, lines like these of Father Charles L. O'Donnell:

A ROAD OF IRELAND

From Killybegs to Ardara is seven Irish miles,
'Tis there the blackbirds whistle and the mating cuckoos call,

Beyond the fields the green sea glints, above the heaven smiles

On all the white boreens that thread the glens of Donegal.

Along the roads what feet have passed, could they but tell the story,

Of ancient king and saint and bard, the roads have known them all;

Lough Dergh, Doon Well, Glen Columcille, the names are yet a glory.

'Tis great ghosts in the gloaming remember Donegal.

The harbor ships of Killybegs glistened with Spanish sail

The days Spain ventured round the world and held the half in thrall,

And Ardara has writ her name in the proud books of the Gael,

Though sleep has fallen on them now in dreaming Donegal.

Well, time will have its fling with dust, it is the changeless law,

But this I like to think of whatever may befall:

When she came up from Killybegs and he from Ardara,

My father met my mother on the road, in Donegal.

St. Patrick's Day Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me last night at the Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, your eminence, Mr. Mayor, distinguished guests, members and guests of the Friendly Sons:

We are here to pay our respects to St. Patrick. In his day, as every wearer of the green will recall and all others should be advised, he drove the snakes out of his beloved Ireland.

He used a stout stick for he understood that in dealing with snakes they would have been unimpressed by the use of either mere talk or discussion backed up with only a feather duster. Even a good stout shillelagh would not work if its value was neutralized by the lack of will to use it to meet the threat at hand.

Today the world faces the serpent of communism which has spread its venom on a worldwide scale.

The age in which St. Patrick lived was one in which ancient institutions were breaking down and confusion reigned in men's minds. The Roman Empire was disintegrating and with it the political structure of the civilized world. Christian civilization in north Africa was wiped out by the vandals. Because of the withdrawal of Roman troops, Britain, which had under Roman protection reached a high degree of civilized life, was left unprotected to the inroads of such marauders as the pagan band which carried Patrick off. Fear and uncertainty were everywhere in that chaotic time.

Into his part of that world Patrick brought two great and related ideas—faith and freedom.

He was first and foremost an apostle of the Christian faith. There were apparently Christians in Ireland before him, but he made the country dominantly Christian, and so thoroughly that Ireland became for the next 700 years a center of learning and a center of missionary activity. From Ireland missionaries went to Scotland, to northern and central Europe. Ireland was a kind of headquarters of culture and religion for western Europe.

At the time, and quite logically so, Patrick was an apostle of freedom. He had been a captive. Now he endeavored to make people free.

The story of St. Patrick is of peculiar relevance today. Fear and uncertainty reign in various places. Moreover, there is a great, powerful, and concerted attack on just the things for which St. Patrick stood.

Communism, which is stalking over the world today, is the denial of religious faith and at the same time the denial of human freedom. Communism is godless. It is also a system of slavery based on contempt for, and oppression of, the common man.

But there is that which will defeat communism. It is just the twofold vital quality which St. Patrick wielded as his weapon—faith in God and faith in human free-

dom. These are indestructible and while we cling to them we are indestructible too. This is the lesson of St. Patrick.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China there are still some simple souls who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union has vetoed the admission of 17 nations into the United Nations, none of which have committed an act of aggression since the formation of that organization 10 years ago. Significantly Ireland, Portugal, and Spain were all "honored" by the Soviet veto. Ireland first applied for membership in 1946 and the Soviet Union has vetoed their application, three different times though more than two-thirds of the General Assembly has voted to approve the membership.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of Communist aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the aggressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen; 11 of these have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

How can our associates even consider compromising principle and honor to that extent? What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

Based alone on the Soviet Union's failure to support the United Nations action in Korea and to abide by its charter obligations the Soviet Union should have been expelled from membership.

Have we forgotten St. Paul's injunction in second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Communist Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless Marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

There will never be peace in our time in any real sense until the people of Russia and China have thrown out their Communist masters and established justice in their political system, freed their economy from the dead hand of statism concentrated on armament production and, more important than all, reopened their churches so that the guidance of the Father of us all may replace the godless teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

The crucifix is a more potent force than the clenched fist of communism.

When the people of Russia and China gain their freedom from the tyranny which temporarily rules them we should make it known that our friendship and our assistance will be available for the establishment of peace with honor in a truly free world of freemen.

We seek not 1 foot of their territory nor control over a solitary one of their people.

We only want for them the cherished freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience; to have in the hands of a truly free people the right of self-determination on who shall constitute their government and the right to change it by the decision of 200 million people rather than a cabal of less than a dozen power-mad men in the Kremlin who threaten the peace of the world; and to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor and a rising standard of living.

We should look upon the people within the Iron Curtain as our friends and allies. Indeed, should their totalitarian masters embark upon further aggression the temporarily enslaved people may turn out to be among our stoutest allies.

Such a policy does not contemplate aggression on the part of the free world. But it does require that we never by word or deed give our moral or legal blessing to the enslavement of the 800 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Such a policy does contemplate the application of moral, economic, and diplomatic sanctions against the international Communist conspiracy against the free way of life. Human freedom is a God-given right beyond the power of dictatorships to permanently destroy.

It is difficult for me to understand how the British Foreign Minister could urge the turning over of Quemoy and Matsu Islands to the Communists on the grounds they are close to the Communist mainland and be silent about Hong Kong which is closer and would be an even bigger feather in their cap.

It may be clever, but it is not honorable to pay the ransom to the Communists with the other fellows assets. America should have no part of any such deal.

The United States and Ireland learned that people must be prepared to fight for freedom if they are to achieve it.

Another Patrick (Patrick Henry) on March 23, 1775 (about 4 years after the friendly sons was organized), in the Virginia Legislature said:

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God: I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

In his day Lincoln understood that this Nation could not continue "half slave and half free." In the age of the airplane and the atomic and hydrogen weapons the world cannot long continue half slave and half free.

In 1865 at his second inaugural Lincoln expanded this doctrine when he said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history * * * we here have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

This I believe: Under the divine guidance that made us and kept us a free Nation this generation of Americans will not sacrifice principle for expediency; nor cringe in the face of brutal naked aggression and we will not barter friends and allies in the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, Africa or Asia in a dishonorable appeasement at a far eastern Munich or a second Yalta.

Statement in Support of H. R. 4903, Chapter 7, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dealing With Additional Payments to School Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Appropriations Committee for its action in including in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1955, a provision for \$20 million as an additional amount for payments to school districts for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 874, and thus for the current year making available 100 percent of entitlements as the result of the suspension, pursuant to Public Law 732, of the 3-percent absorption feature of Public Law 874 as amended by Public Law 248, of the 83d Congress.

This is of tremendous importance to the First District of Florida, as it is to many other areas of the country where federally impacted areas exist, thereby placing a greater responsibility on the local school boards and taxpayers, to provide educational facilities. The existing appropriation of \$55 million for payment to school districts for the 1955 fiscal year resulted in the payment of only 65 percent of full entitlement to the school districts qualifying. The \$20 million additional appropriation provided in this bill will permit payment of 100 percent entitlement to the eligible school districts.

I received communications from the Honorable J. Crockett Farnell, superintendent of Hillsborough County public schools, which provide a concrete example of the tremendous importance of this supplemental appropriation, in that it will mean approximately an additional \$35,000 to help bear a portion of the additional cost of educating approximately 2,000 federally connected pupils who must be absorbed by the educational system of that one county that has an average total daily attendance of some 50,000 pupils. Of the 2,000 federally connected pupils a sufficient number qualify for only a one-half pupil rating to reduce the number below 1,500, or below 3 percent of the total enrollment.

These figures will, it appears, clearly justify and substantiate the wisdom of the Congress in the last session eliminating the 3 percent absorption feature contained in Public Law 874, amended by

Public Law 248, of the 83d Congress, said suspension for 1 fiscal year being contained in Public Law 732. Without this provision this county, which bears a tremendous burden of Federal impact, due to the existence of one of the largest Air Force bases in the country, MacDill Field, would be unable to qualify under the act and would thereby lose a hundred thousand dollars as an average per year as a partial contribution toward the education of these 2,000 federally connected pupils. This contribution pays for only a portion of the educational costs and certainly this participation is justified on the facts involved, and I hope will demonstrate clearly the need for continuing the elimination of this 3-percent-absorption feature.

I am hoping that Congress will, in this session, recognize the tremendous importance of many areas of continued elimination of the 3-percent-absorption provision, and will enact legislation similar to H. R. 850 designed to accomplish this in subsequent fiscal years.

Russia, China, and the Outlook in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the evening of March 16, 1955, it was my privilege to address the Intelligence Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association. That is composed of the Intelligence Services of the Army, the Navy, and other groups. I spoke on the subject Russia, China, and the Outlook in the Pacific. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA, CHINA, AND THE OUTLOOK IN THE PACIFIC

As we look out on the world and ponder the problems that confront us, their very magnitude leads us at times to see only the dark side of the picture.

Unless those problems solve themselves, we must continue to seek solutions. And while seeking them, in association with our allies, we must keep up our guard, remain strong, and be prepared to meet any new danger which may threaten our security or that of the free world.

Yet the outlook is far from hopeless. Viewed superficially, or basing our conclusions on day-to-day developments, it might be thought fairly desperate. But if we dig deeper and look at the fundamentals, we can even be fairly cheerful.

There are favorable factors at work that justify an optimistic outlook. The facts of human nature likewise should strengthen our faith in the future.

The facts of history belie the concept that human beings will accept tyrannical rule indefinitely, or that tyrants cannot be overthrown.

The historic relationships of Eurasian peoples—including the Chinese and Russians—disclose more points of conflict, including

conflicts of interest, than there are points of agreement.

Communism itself, although assuming malevolent form in its present incarnation, becomes a menace only as it is linked to nationalistic and imperialistic ambitions centering in Moscow and Peiping. In its basic philosophy it did not originate with Karl Marx. It is as old as mankind, and there have been communistic societies, or attempts to set them up, as far back as we can see in our study of human institutions.

To dispose of that subject first, and briefly, it is one of the simple facts of history that from the earliest times down to the present, these communistic communities have died out and either disappeared completely or passed through successive mutations into a pattern more nearly reflecting the competitive nature of life and the aspiration of human beings to pursue happiness and struggle for life's rewards in their own way. Communism has always failed when tried, because it conflicts with the fundamentals of human nature. It will fail in Russia and China for the same basic reason.

But it will fail for another reason also. It will fail because communism itself cannot compete with individualism. It must fail; because slaves and slave states cannot compete with free institutions and with free men living in free countries. It must fail because, under communism, and under dictatorial regimes and tyrannical rule, there is lacking the incentive to achievement which inspires free men to reach the heights they do.

A single illustration points the moral here: Russia and China are both suffering from food shortages. In the United States our problem is not shortages, but surpluses. Elsewhere in the free world the production of wheat, rice, meat, dairy products, and other dietary essentials is increasing constantly. The Communist world, experimenting with collectivism, and with orders for food production handed down from above through a Communist bureaucracy, and with production at the source supervised by Communist overseers, suffers from hunger.

If the hungry peoples who are still free can be shown how to increase their own food supplies, and if we can help them to do this (meanwhile sharing our surpluses with them, as we have and will), they too will follow the path of freedom rather than fall into the lockstep of communism.

Now to be specific concerning Russia and China:

Moscow continues to growl and threaten, to abuse the rest of us, and to flood the free world with lying propaganda designed—though unsuccessfully—to convince it that the Soviet Union is the world's most powerful nation.

Can a nation suffering from food shortages, and which has to choose between guns and butter, consumer goods and the products of heavy industry, be so categorized? Hardly. With all of her progress of the last 25 or 30 years in some directions, Russia still cannot grow enough food for her people, and actually has fewer cattle now than when the Russian peasant was little more than a serf, but still had freedom enough to run his farm in his own way.

What about Russia's relations with China? Does this constitute a true partnership, or is Russia making China pay through the nose for whatever the Red regime gets—meanwhile pushing off on the Peiping government obsolete and surplus war equipment which Russia herself no longer wants?

To a limited extent it pays Russia to help Red China. As China develops economically, it can become a market for Russian products—when Russia has enough of anything to export. As China becomes stronger militarily, the Red regime and the Red Army can be used to threaten China's neighbors. But it also serves Russia's purposes; for by encouraging China to under-

take military adventures in the Far East, Russia makes sure that there will be no Chinese thrust to the north or west—into Siberia or Mongolia.

China is kept in a state of subjection as surely as if she were one of the lesser satellites of the Soviet Union. And to the extent that China's resources go into her Army and Air Force, with no real hope that they can be used to enlarge her territory or advance her interests—China is kept weak economically, or at least weaker than if the whole energies of her industrious people were devoted to developing her resources for her own benefit.

Thus, it may be suspected that Russia has a darkly ulterior, as well as a profit motive in giving Red China limited help. Moscow may even encourage Peiping to test our defenses in the Pacific for the double purpose, as they hope, of involving both China and the United States in a military conflict.

But certainly Russia can never afford to allow Red China to become a first-class military power. For whatever else they are, the rulers in the Kremlin are realists. They know their history. And they are not likely to forget that over the historic period the pressure of population on the Eurasian Continent has always come from the East. They will not forget that the Mongol hordes only a few centuries ago, as history is measured, overran Russia repeatedly, burned Moscow at least twice, and that for some 300 years Russia was forced to pay tribute to a Mongol Khan.

So there is a limit to the military and economic assistance Red China can expect from Russia.

Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai might think of themselves as partners of Russia; but sooner or later they will learn—if they have not realized it thus far—that they are not partners.

Russia is using Red China and will use her, so long as it serves Russian purposes, and so long as the Peiping government permits itself to be so used.

The Chinese rulers, for their part, will not be likely to forget the historic record. It is Russia that has hemmed China in. A glance at the map will show this vividly. China cannot move either north or west into sparsely populated areas with presumably substantial resources awaiting development, without coming into conflict with Russia.

What country took over Mongolia at a moment of Chinese weakness? Russia.

What neighbor moved into Manchuria and forced concessions there from China? Russia.

What supposed friend led China into a hopeless war in Korea, draining Chinese resources and costing the lives of a million Chinese? Russia.

What country stripped Manchuria of Japanese industrial equipment after World War II, leaving Communist China with the problem of rebuilding that formerly busy area, as developed during the Japanese occupation? Russia.

Only twice in Chinese history—once during the Mongol period, under the reign of Kublai Khan, in what is known as the Yuan Dynasty, and again under the Manchus—have the people of China gone south into Burma, Cambodia, and beyond, for purposes of military conquest.

These expeditions failed, and there is nothing in the present situation to suggest that any new Chinese military move in that direction would prove more successful, even without our intervention.

And the United States would intervene. Let there be no mistake on that point. And with a suddenness and strength that would open Asian eyes.

The Red rulers of China know this.

As to Formosa, the answer is equally clear: There is no possibility whatever that the men who sit in Peiping could take Formosa

against the opposition represented by the Nationalist government on that island, supported by United States naval and air strength. And the Red Chinese know this, too.

The Chinese never have been a maritime people. They could no more reach out into the Pacific over the opposition of the free nations, including the Asian people in countries nearby, and of course including ourselves, than they could march to Moscow against Russia's military might on land. The Chinese know this.

If they feel themselves bottled up in China, they might look at the map again, and see who it is that has bottled them up. The map tells the story. The only territory formerly included in the Chinese empire which has been taken from China was taken from them by Russia.

When China has felt impelled to move into new territory in the past, the people of that country have moved—with the unsuccessful exceptions noted previously—either north or west. There has been trouble on her northern and western frontiers since before the Christian era.

It would not be altogether surprising if, at some future date, there should again be trouble there.

Moreover, the Chinese people, who enjoyed a high degree of culture before the first Russians emerged from the northern forests, certainly cannot enjoy subordinating themselves to the Russians now—or knowing that if Russia can prevent it they can never rise to equality with their neighbor to the west.

The Communists can settle down in China and behave themselves, so far as their conduct concerns others, or they can invite trouble, and undoubtedly find it in whatever direction they move.

And Communist Russia can do the same thing, as of today; for if they should move into Europe, beyond the present boundaries of the Communist bloc, they would invite destruction of all that they have gained, or built, in more than a quarter of a century.

That, then, is the picture.

These are some of the things we too often forget, or overlook, or fail to think about as we pass through this time of trouble.

On the whole, I think we have reason to be encouraged.

In the end, I believe the world will emerge into a better day.

Ultimately, we can hope, the Russian and Chinese people will throw off the tyranny of pseudo-communism, a dialectic screen for totalitarian rule by self-serving dictators—and again join the ranks of the free nations.

For the present, we shall watch, wait, pray, keep our powder dry, our Seventh Fleet in the Formosa Straits, and our airbases around the perimeter of Russia.

And we shall have faith that out of this formula will come, before long, a happier world for all of us.

National Correct Posture Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning National Correct Posture Week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

I wish to call attention to the increasing importance of a vital phase of our national welfare—the general health of all our citizens.

It has long been realized that the stress and strain of modern living have contributed materially toward the present-day afflictions of the American people.

The so-called high-pressure mode of living has brought an increasing awareness of the mental ills which beset the people of this Nation in disturbing numbers. The formation of many new mental-health associations attest to this fact.

Much work is being done by the National Chiropractic Association, which again this year—from May 1 to May 7—is acting as sponsor for National Correct Posture Week.

This association, through activities in connection with the special week and throughout the year, is bringing a simple, elemental, yet often overlooked basic-health fact to the attention of the Nation, and that is the importance of correct posture.

From the formative years of school age, on through to adulthood, it is vitally important that our people maintain their good posture as a firm foundation for general good health and well being.

The value of this special week is indicated by the fact that many of our mayors and governors have issued special proclamations urging the people to participate in the special educational activities during National Correct Posture Week.

It is significant to note that our Nation's schools are paying special attention to this worthy program of training for our young people.

I attach for the RECORD a statement prepared by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D. C., who is director of public relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

STATEMENT PREPARED BY DR. EMMETT J. MURPHY

No greater contribution can be made by the chiropractors of America to the Nation than by improving posture and thus increasing the efficiency of all our workers. Poor posture is expensive, and poor posture habits are responsible not only for many days of lost time, but for poor response to job needs, and eventually for a shortened life of top efficiency.

The problem of poor posture and the low efficiency of workers which it brings on can be approached in two ways.

The first is a long, careful, and well-planned program to teach Americans how to walk and stand and sit in ways which will promote health and efficiency. We have such an educational program under way, and it is having its effect.

However, that takes time. Meanwhile, many postural faults can be helped by direct treatment, or the bad effects can be modified or eliminated.

CHIROPRACTORS PLAY DECISIVE ROLE

In both programs individual chiropractors can play a decisive and important role.

They can continue to carry out the program of education. They can explain to their patients how to walk, stand, sit, and lie for the best effect on health. They can give their patients the publications of the National Chiropractic Association on the subject and win their cooperation.

They can also continue to relieve the bad results of poor posture by correcting the misalignments of the spine. Every chiropractor knows that the most minor displacements in the spinal column can bring on sharp pains,

often far removed from the spine itself, which disappear under chiropractic treatment.

TEST YOUR POSTURE

Good posture is a result of holding your body in a balanced position. The easiest way to attain it is to think of an imaginary line running (side view) from the tip of the skull through your neck, shoulders, hips, knees, and insteps. When the head is bent forward, the abdomen thrust out, or the back bent, the line of gravity is shifted, and a strain placed on muscles to keep the body from falling.

To test: Stand with back to wall with head, heels, shoulders, and calves of legs touching it, hands by sides. Flatten hollow of back by pressing buttocks down against the wall. Space at back of waist should not be greater than the thickness of your hand.

Stand facing close to wall, palms of hands touching front of thighs. If chest touches wall first, your posture is probably excellent, or at least good; if head touches first, it is only fair; if abdomen touches first, your posture is really bad, and you should see a chiropractor.

Standing

When you stand straight your head should be balanced and erect. Your shoulders are relaxed and low; your chest is held high. Your lower back should curve to just a slight degree. Your abdomen should be flat. Have your knees straight but not stiff, and feel your weight in the outer borders of your feet.

Sitting

You should sit with your feet flat on the floor. Do not slump in a chair, but keep your back straight and your abdomen flat. As in standing, your head should be erect and well balanced. When you lean forward, lean from the hips, not from the waist.

Walking

Movement should start at the hips. Your head and upper part of your body should remain at right angles to the ground. Swing your arms freely. Look ahead, never down. Point your toes straight ahead. Knees should be relaxed and free.

SECOND LARGEST HEALING PROFESSION

Chiropractic, as an organized professional body, is 58 years old, and now ranks as the second largest healing profession.

Licensed by law in 44 States, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and 7 Provinces of Canada, there are some 22,000 chiropractors in the United States (against a population of 161 million) and 1,030 in Canada (against a population of 15 million).

Chiropractic is an established but growing and dynamic profession, which has adopted high professional standards and ethics through formal action of the National Chiropractic Association.

Officials of the National Chiropractic Association believe it to be the most democratic professional body in the United States. It employs no sanctions of legal or economic force against nonmembers and strives to achieve its goal of professional unity through education and in a manner discussed and approved by the national membership.

FOUR-YEAR COURSE IS EDUCATION STANDARD

Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hours in a standard 4-year course to obtain accredited ratings from the committee on educational standards of the National Chiropractic Association. A basic course of 4,400 hours is recommended.

The curriculum and hours of study parallel the minimum requirements of the American Medical Association for class A schools.

Up to 2 years of preprofessional (college) education is required by State chiropractic laws of licensure. A large percentage of students entering approved chiropractic colleges today have college degrees.

CHIROPRACTIC COMPARES WELL

In every way chiropractic as a healing profession, compares well with other professions.

Sound chiropractic education is encouraged not only by the national council on education of the National Chiropractic Association but also by the student loan fund and other devices designed to provide aid for gifted students.

Chiropractic education has a lower gross cost than that of other professions, but average incomes for practitioners fall into the median group of all professions.

BASIC CURRICULUM

The following typical or basic curriculum for approved chiropractic colleges is based on the National Chiropractic Association code for a minimum of 4,000 hours in a 4-year course:

Subject:	Hours
Anatomy, including embryology and histology	740
Physiology	240
Biochemistry	180
Pathology and bacteriology	520
Public health, sanitation, hygiene	160
Practice of chiropractic (principles and technique, neurology and psychiatry, pediatrics, dermatology and syphilology, urology, ophthalmology, otolaryngology, first aid and minor surgery, roentgenology)	1,960
Obstetrics and gynecology	200
Total	4,000

Statement in Support of a Bill Extending Certain Veteran's Benefits to or on Behalf of Dependent Husbands and Widowers of Female Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill into this Congress that would provide that, in those provisions of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration which relate to compensation, pension, retirement pay, and subsistence allowance, the terms "wife" and "dependent" shall include a dependent husband and the term "widow" shall include a widower whenever his condition is such that, if his wife were living, he would be dependent upon her for support.

This is one of the most compassionate requests I may make to you today. I take this opportunity to point out several of the merits of this measure. My sincerity in this case has been heightened by several cases in the First District of Florida of which I would recite one to bring into sharp focus the real need of many wives of the veterans of our wars in defense of this great Nation.

This resident of my district is a disabled female veteran, and her husband, because of physical disability, is entirely dependent upon his wife for support and comfort. It falls upon this woman the responsibility of providing a home for her husband and giving to this disabled

man such comforts as life may bring him in his condition. This is a task that she welcomes as part of her matrimonial vows and one which she has cheerfully and fully taken upon herself. Who is this woman? She is one of those upon whom this Nation called for service in the defense of our Nation in the dire years of World War II. I think it is time to remind this House that these women were volunteers in our service. They had put their country above many of the comforts of home and had served beyond the call of duty to their Nation. It is time that we recognized their devotion and their service. It is time that we placed their responsibilities today on the same basis as the responsibilities of those veterans who receive the benefits of the compensation provided by the Veterans' Administration for dependents who cannot care for themselves.

In the bill that I have today proposed such relief would be provided. In the case of the individual I have recommended for your consideration the amount of additional compensation would be in the vicinity of \$27 per month. This is a small amount to each of us individually. This is a large amount to the veteran for whom I would provide some of the smaller benefits of life.

I believe that this legislation is highly desirable, both on the basis of providing uniformity and because it is sound policy to make the benefits available to the dependent husbands of widowers of female veterans in the same manner as they are available to the wives and widows of male veterans. In view of the service rendered to the country during World War II particularly, and in a lesser extent during World War I, by female components of the Armed Forces, it is believed that such action is only fair and just.

There are approximately 300,000 living veterans of World War II, and there is no information on which to base an estimate of the number who would be affected by the passage of this legislation. Therefore no fixed cost estimate can be provided.

These last two paragraphs of explanation of the bill are from the report of the committee of the 81st Congress in support of earlier bills. These statements are true today. They are more true as each year cases occur which place more of the family responsibility upon these female veterans.

It is my most sincere hope this Congress shall make such benefits available to the women who have served our Nation.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Jefferson-Jackson Day address delivered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at Raleigh, N. C., on February 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Hodges, Senator ERVIN, Senator SCOTT, members of the North Carolina congressional delegation, representatives of the Democratic National Committee, and the North Carolina State Democratic Committee, my fellow Democrats, ladies, and gentlemen, it is not from allegiance to a political party that I visit North Carolina today. I am not here because the Democratic National Committee selected me to speak at this occasion. Instead I come in the name of friendship and long association with men whose lives have touched my own—men whose fine character helped strengthen me in difficult days and whose confidence sustains me and will as long as I may live.

In such a list is your fine Governor. Thirty years ago we sweetered in the June heat of a Dallas hotel room and struggled to bring about the election of a fine citizen of North Carolina to the presidency of the World Rotary movement. We began then a friendship which has lasted through the years.

True friendship, of course, permits an occasional imposition upon it, and I imposed on Luther in an hour of great difficulty. It is a story that I must repeat here tonight.

When I took the oath of office as Secretary of Agriculture, the President made me as well War Food Administrator which led to the added chore of Chairman of the World Food Board. On the first day, I was handed a receipt which I was obliged to sign—a receipt for \$1.5 billion worth of garden seeds, cotton, corn, wheat, and potatoes—heavy on the potatoes—owned by Commodity Credit Corporation. I signed it, and then I phoned New York and found that Luther was back in North Carolina.

I notified Luther that we had just bought a business. He asked how much we paid for it and I told him a billion and a half dollars. There was silence on the other end of the phone line and finally I felt obliged to ask him, "Luther, do you have any questions?" "Yes," he said, "I would like to know what we bought, where it is, and what shape it's in."

"Good," I told him, "Come to Washington and find out those three things for both of us."

Thus began a distinguished chapter of service to the American people. Luther Hodges sought to find out how the Department of Agriculture which had been required to ship billions of dollars worth of food and fiber to our armed services, both at home and abroad, and to allies across every sea and in every part of the earth, could now account for these enormous shipments and at the same time develop an inventory of the goods then on hand. He brought into the Department of Agriculture experts on physical inventories. He took in pay only an amount which covered a portion of each day's hotel bill; but at the end of his service, the Commodity Credit knew what it had, where it was and what shape it was in. There have been numerous investigations of Government agencies, charges and countercharges about fur coats and deep freezes, but the Department of Agriculture came out of that period without a breath of scandal. For that rare good fortune I owe complete thanks to a handful of men including the present distinguished Governor of North Carolina, Luther Hodges.

When he informed me that the Democrats of North Carolina were having a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner and asked me to make an address to the Democrats, I welcomed the

chance because I have long desired to pay public testimony to his work and rejoice again in the privilege of calling Martha and Luther our friends as you delight to call him your governor.

Grant me now the privilege of a few words about some other Carolinians.

North Carolina bows to no State in the excellence of its representation in the United States Senate. I am proud that SAM IRVIN and KERR SCOTT are Democrats.

Few men in my time have so quickly achieved the Senate stature of your senior Senator, SAM IRVIN. Long respected and esteemed here in North Carolina for his great judicial ability and dedication to high principle and purpose, he was little known in the Nation when, last June, he succeeded the beloved, late Senator Clyde Hoey.

Then suddenly he was named to the Senate select committee which handled the McCarthy censure resolution. His distinguished service on that committee was not only a great credit to North Carolina, to the Senate, and to the Nation; it also brought him nationwide attention and acclaim.

Many have predicted that Senator IRVIN's speech on the censure resolution will rank among the great speeches of the Senate. It was a masterpiece of logic and eloquence. Listen to these words from that famous address:

"The Senate," said he, "is trying this issue: Was Senator McCARTHY guilty of disorderly behavior in his senatorial office? The American people are trying another issue. The issue before the American people transcends in importance the issue before the Senate. The issue before the American people is simply this: Does the Senate of the United States have enough manhood to stand up to Senator McCARTHY? The honor of the Senate is in our keeping. I pray that Senators will not soil it by permitting Senator McCARTHY to go unwhipped of senatorial justice."

From that day on, the stature of SAM IRVIN in the Senate of the United States was established. His ringing words fell on the consciences of reasonable men. You know the verdict, and we know our colleague!

May I turn now to your junior Senator?

I first had the great pleasure of working with KERR SCOTT when I was Secretary of Agriculture. He was then your Commissioner of Agriculture, and an excellent one.

In 1948 we both left the immediate arena of agriculture. I went to the Senate. KERR SCOTT became your Governor.

Under his vigorous, progressive leadership, North Carolina set a new pace of progress in many fields. Your new rural roads and highways, your hospitals and schools, your expanded electric-power facilities are monuments to an era of action. They are living tributes to the zeal, energy, and high purpose of KERR SCOTT.

I would not want to forget those members of the North Carolina delegation who serve in the House of Representatives. When I came to the House in 1941, I found HERBERT BONNER near me in the Old House Office Building. He had entered the House to take the place of the beloved and highly respected Lindsay Warren. Tonight I congratulate the State of North Carolina on Herbert's elevation to chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Of course, I have had many opportunities to watch the work and the fidelity to his task of the dean of your delegation, HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and one of the top figures of our Congress in importance to his State and to the Nation. While Secretary of Agriculture I had the benefit of his experience and counsel. Now in the Senate I take some interest in agricultural legislation; and while HAROLD COOLEY and I are not always on the same side and frequently are on

opposite sides of agricultural questions, nothing has impaired my admiration for him, nor altered my conviction that he is a true friend of the farmers of the United States.

Obviously I must not prolong my praise of your congressional delegation of this remarkable State, but surely I would never forgive myself if I did not mention CARL DURHAM, who is my opposite number on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. When the Democrats control again the House of Representatives in the 1956 elections, CARL DURHAM will become chairman of the joint committee, and a very fine chairman he will be. We all admire him for the quiet, gentlemanly way in which he goes about his tasks. The Nation will be fortunate to have a man of his stature as head of that very important committee.

With GRAHAM BARDEN, a long-time member of your delegation and now the able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, these are the Congressmen with whom I served when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. You have added other capable and talented men and I would like to consider each one; but I will content myself with saying that this collection of strong men in the House of Representatives is a great political and economic asset for the State of North Carolina, and the Democrats over the Nation rejoice in your good fortune.

This mention of rejoicing seems automatically to bring me into the current economic and political situation. The last time I was moving around the country making Jefferson-Jackson Day speeches in any number was in 1948. That was a period when we were taking a rather vigorous pounding from critics across the Nation, and as a member of the Truman administration, I was allergic to the subject of mink coats and deep freezes, even though I had purchased my own deep freeze and had a legitimate, well documented sales slip to prove it. But in the recent campaign I found that the Republicans have developed a few deep freezes of their own. The most noted one from my standpoint was on display in the 83d Congress when the then junior Senator from Kentucky, John Sherman Cooper, sought to get into the White House to tell the President of the United States the facts of life about the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Dixon-Yates contract. When Senator Cooper got to the desk of Sherman Adams, whether in person or on the phone, he learned what a deep freeze really was (he couldn't talk to the President); and even though he got a momentary Presidential handclasp in the closing days of his campaign, it never succeeded in thawing out from the minds of the people of his State the autumn frostbite given him at the White House, and he went down to defeat by the old warrior, ALBEN BARKLEY.

These and other Republican activities helped in additional Democratic victories in November. They made it possible for our party to redeem the Congress and bring it under Democratic control. We saw what Secretary McKay's partnership in resource development could do to the race of a conservative Senator like Guy Cordon of Oregon. We saw what an unsympathetic attitude on unemployment could do to a vulnerable Senator like Homer Ferguson of Michigan. We saw how vigorous campaigning could win for Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY in Wyoming against the heaviest barrage of slush and slime that any western candidate ever faced. But most of all we saw Democratic candidates for governor sweep the Republican strongholds and show by their victories that there was an abundance of popular support for Democratic principles in every part of the Nation, and that the support was so widespread and deep rooted that a Democratic victory in 1956 seemed virtually assured.

Let's take a quick look at the effect of those governorship races. We gained 9 governorships without losing a single one. We made the greatest increase in governorships which was ever made in a 2-year period by either major party since the great Democratic landslide in 1932. Governors were elected in 1953 and 1954 in 36 States and we won 21 of them. Even in the States that we lost, the Democratic percentage of the popular vote improved in every one of them except two—Idaho and Massachusetts—and we think there definitely were local conditions which caused our troubles in those States.

When we count the States that swung into the Democratic column in these elections of 1953 and 1954, we sense that in the 21 States where the Democrats elected governors, there are 284 electoral votes. Now our Republican friends captured 15 States but those States had total electoral votes numbering only 124. As a matter of fact, if you add the 6 States where Democrats have held over Democratic governors to the ones we won, we then count 27 States which together have 347 electoral votes—far more than needed to make a Democrat President and about two-thirds of the total. So the future looks bright.

What brought this swing to Democrats? What helped us carry New York and Pennsylvania, and kept Ohio and Michigan heavily in our fold? What won back our governorships in Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona which had become part of the great Democratic desert?

For my part, I want to look at the plight of the American farmer, for I think he may still influence deeply the economics of this Nation and that his distress has been the symbol if not the source of Republican political decay.

So let's talk about farming. Yours is a great agricultural State, and you have as deep an interest in farming as any State in the Union.

One of my hobbies has been checking on farm income, and I have made calculations to show what parity would have produced for the American farmer through the years and contrasted that with what the farmer actually received. I start with the year 1910 because that was the beginning of the parity base.

We use 1910 through 1914 as the 5 years which are the golden age of American agriculture. Conditions were so ideal during that period that parity on many products and originally on all products was figured on that base.

So I've gone back to the beginning of that period and checked the income of American farmers from 1910 to 1953, and have discovered that farm income depends upon the zeal of the administrator of farm programs and not solely on the text of the current law.

Since 1910 Republicans have held power for 16 years. In that period full 100-percent parity income would have been \$103,153,000,000. Actual farm income was \$92,030,000,000, a deficit of \$11,123,000,000 during Republican control.

The Democrats were in for 28 years, and in that time estimated parity income, full 100-percent parity, was \$209,208,000,000. Actual income to farmers was \$265,921,000,000, a surplus of \$56,713,000,000.

In other words, while the Republicans were in, farmers of this country got \$11 billion less than full parity. While the Democrats were in the farmers of this country got \$56,713,000,000 more than full parity.

That suggests to me that the party which knows how to do the job of protecting the American farmer is the party which has built the price support program, which set up the machinery, and which understands that no farm program is worth its salt if it doesn't save the farmer from the sheriff.

I'm going to talk about farm income this evening because I see things on the agricultural front that I don't like. Farm debt is

getting bigger. There has been a 63-percent increase in farm mortgage debt in 8 years and yet we had 90-percent supports every one of these years and good administration of farm laws during many of them. I'm convinced that we will never do the job by price supports alone; that we have to do it by active markets at home and abroad, and have at the same time Secretaries of Agriculture who are fighting to get the highest possible level of agricultural income in this country. Secretaries who want to get the top dollar—not a part of it—for the farmers of our Nation.

I say that because I realize that the net income to farmers from farming in 1953 was only 4.3 percent of the national income. That was the lowest it has ever been in the history of this country. I look back for comparison at the figures when I was in the Department. In 1946 farm income was 9.4 percent of the national income; in 1947 and 1948 it was an even 9 percent of national income. And yet, the last year for which figures are fully available—1953—the percentage was 4.3 percent, the lowest we have ever known.

But brace yourselves, because 1954 will be found to have been even lower. Even in 1932, which was the year of depression, the farmers received more than 5.5 percent of the national income, but the preliminary figures for 1954 indicate that farmers' net income that year was less than 4.2 percent of national income—an all-time low. The farmer didn't get his share of prosperity but he gets more than his share of recession.

That's why I say that in the Department of Agriculture we need not so much a set of rules as a ruling spirit, not so much a program of supports as a Samson who will not tear down but hold erect the pillars of agricultural prices. This Nation has not reached the peak of national income. Statisticians and economists predict that income will reach \$500 billion by 1975 and probably earlier than that. If the farm areas of the country then receive a full share, our farm income would be more than double what it now is. But instead of that, the figures reveal that since 1947 national income has increased more than \$100 billion; and farm income, instead of following it up and thereby increasing five to seven billion dollars since its 1947 peak of \$16½ billion, has dropped \$4¼ billion. It is that tragic trend which must first be stopped and then reversed before farm prosperity is possible in America, and only Democrats will do the job.

I realize that some may comment that I have supported the President's Secretary of Agriculture. What possibly is overlooked is that he recommended an agricultural program which I had presented to the Congress 9 years ago, which incidentally had its beginnings in the flexible support system written into the Agricultural Act of 1938 and advocated with more or less consistency through the years of Democratic administration. Naturally, I was pleased to find him recognizing the merits of Democratic programs. That wasn't the only Democratic agricultural program which he embraced. He sent us a wool bill which we incorporated into the last agricultural act. It followed the principles of a wool bill submitted to Congress in 1947 but its method of farmer payment was on all fours with the Brannan plan for supporting perishable farm products. On top of that the perplexing dairy situation turned the Department again in the direction of the Brannan proposal to such a degree that the U. S. News & World Report commented that "Republicans, with a farm problem on their hands . . . are even exploring a modified Brannan plan," and the Scripps-Howard newspapers which were and are strong Eisenhower backers, published a headline reading, *Brannan Plan Still Very Much Alive*.

I predict, of course, that if the Department finally tries to sell butter, cheese, and milk powder on the Brannan formula, the Secretary of Agriculture may catch the same sort of heat in his domestic problems that the Republican Senate leader poured on the President in foreign affairs. Of course, if Mr. Benson gets into hot water on the Brannan plan, it will be no novelty to him. No one could watch his handling of the Ladejinsky matter without realizing that he has a passion for hot water and 1 or 2 more plunges into it will be no novelty either for him or for the Republican administration. I wish him no misfortune. I seek only to keep the record straight on the origin of his agricultural programs.

That has been the best part of the Eisenhower administration—the facility with which it has adopted good Democratic doctrine.

In the very first state of the Union message, President Eisenhower announced that he was "unleashing" the forces of Chiang Kai-shek so that they might attack the Chinese mainland from Formosa. Here are his words: "I am issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China." But here are his more recent words: "The Nationalist Chinese navy and air force have been ordered to cease attacks on Chinese Communist mainland targets as a result of United States pressure." The experience of 2 years with a difficult Formosa problem has brought him to the point where he now favors an open commitment for all the world to heed and remember that we will prevent Red China from seizing the Pescadore Islands and Formosa—precisely what President Truman proclaimed 5 years ago. All Democrats should be glad that such a good American doctrine has found a new home.

I hear more favorable words these days about the doctrine of mutual aid and the Marshall plan. We find a new feeling of appreciation for trade, not aid; and an occasional comment as to how we may achieve a better balance in world trade by falling back on the wisdom of a great Democrat, Cordell Hull.

Let us talk just a little about Mr. Hull's program of reciprocal trade. It seemed to find a new home when on March 30, 1954, the President sent to the Congress his message on foreign trade. He described as its main provision the continuance of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements for another 3 years.

Those of us who were appreciative of the fact that only by an alert and aggressive foreign trade can we save our farmers were warmed by the President's strong message. We knew that once before he had put off a fight with those old-guard Republicans in Congress who believe in the highest of protective tariffs, but now he seemed in his firmly worded message to be telling them that he was ready to fight it out.

Yet within 2 months he made public a letter revealing that he would not fight for his 3-year tariff-cutting program, but would settle for a simple 1-year extension. We Democrats thought that he shouldn't give up so easily. Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, led off a 90-minute debate on foreign trade in which the Senate Democrats freely joined, but not a Republican said a word.

Eighteen of us joined with Senator GORE in offering an amendment which would carry out the President's fighting words of only a few months before. We stood ready to make the fight even if the President wouldn't. The roll was called in the Senate, and 84 percent of the Senate Democrats supported the President's trade program, while 100 percent of the Republicans voted for the weak and feeble 1-year bill. Pretty soon we will be at it again, but this time we will be wondering how much help we will have from the followers of the President in putting across the President's program. These

Democratic policies could be dusted off and win if we could only get some Republicans to follow the Republican leadership.

We Democrats enjoy comparing the promise with the performance.

The budget? The general in the 1952 campaign said, "We can reduce our budget . . . we can live within our means." But Treasury sources today say the deficit was big in 1953, big in 1954, will be big in 1955, and that will continue to be the story.

The national debt? The 1952 Republican platform said, "Our goal . . . is a reduced national debt." But today the Treasury Department is preparing its annual request for permission to raise the debt limit.

Farm prosperity? The Republican platform of 1952 said, "The Republican Party will create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability." The figures I have given you tonight already show that farm net income will be the smallest percentage of national income we have ever known, even in the bottom of the depression.

Family quarrels? The general in the 1952 campaign said, "We shall not allow our Government agencies to fight at the expense of the American people." CARL DURHAM and I know something of their family fights. Indeed, I watched Admiral Strauss and Commissioner Murray of the Atomic Energy Commission argue one day face to face before our committee and I knew then that family quarrels were the order of the day.

Of course, I know what the Senator from Wisconsin has said about the man in the White House; what the Secretary of Commerce says to the Secretary of Labor; what the Senator from California has said about Formosa; and when I went home that evening after watching the argument in the Atomic Energy Committee I opened the Bible that lies beside my telephone and my easy chair and, strangely, my eyes fell on the 17th verse in the 4th chapter of Nehemiah: "They which builded on the wall, and they that bare burdens, with those that laded, everyone with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon." If ever there was a spot where the Commissioners worked with one hand and held a weapon with the other, it was and is the Atomic Energy Commission, and we are promised a replay of that record on Tuesday of this coming week.

Why, the battles of Washington determine even our dreams. One night after a particularly bitter day, my dreams took the pattern of an old-time minstrel show—end men, buck and wing dancers, barbershop quartets, and all the trimmings.

Ed Sullivan had just put on television his tribute to the radio industry and that pageant may have colored my phantasy, for on stage strutted a male chorus, and they sang:

"I wish I were in the land of Dixon
Big deals there are ripe for fixin',
Giveaway, giveaway, giveaway Dixon-Yates."

Then the fade-out and a strong singer with a parody on Gilbert and Sullivan—and the Captain of the King's Navee.

What he sang proved that my dreams were getting better all the time—better and closer to reality. Dr. Lawrence Hafsted, the AEC expert on reactors, had just been hired by the Chase National Bank, the public relations man had joined a New York publicity firm, and the general manager himself had resigned to take a huge salary because he couldn't live on the \$20,000 we were paying him. So the singer on my dream stage sang:

"Now friends and pals, wherever you may be
You'll never get rich in the AEC.
If you want to make a mark and a dollar too,

Just take this advice I give to you.
The advice that I give is all for free
Get a new job in industry."

As they left our schooling and went out into the world of more and bigger bucks, they

sang in tribute to their training ground and their alma mater:

"There by Mississippi's waters
On a bank of mud
"Sits our generating station
Covered by a flood."

The real target of the Dixon-Yates feud, of course, was the TVA and the salute to TVA came in Clementine:

"In a canyon, in a valley
Generating tax-free juice
"Stands a hydropower project
Socialism on the loose."

Suddenly the male chorus sang again—this time the Notre Dame Victory March:

"Cheer, cheer for old Dixon-Yates,
Cheer while we boldly jack up the rates
Send the bill to AEC
Pray that they keep from bankruptcy
What though our taxes be great or small
Old Uncle Sam will pay for them all.
Here's to those who foot our bills, and
Forward to Solvency."

Yes, in spite of the Gore amendment, Uncle Sam will pay the taxes. Even my dream wasn't wrong on that.

Of course, the Yale men didn't sing the Notre Dame song. They just tip-toed around in the currency singing, "Moola, Moola."

But then the last scene—just Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates alone on the stage for a final number.

What do you suppose they were singing? "My Country 'tis of Thee?" No. "America, the Beautiful?" No. "Carolina in the Morning?" Never that. "Bringing in the Sheaves?" Well, that's close, but they were really singing: "There's a Gold Mine in the Sky."

Now for a few words that I want to say on my own. I have been steadily in Washington for the past 14 years and had spent much time there in the previous ten. The battles over social security, collective bargaining, public resource development, and the like, which agitated us so severely decades ago, seem now about ended.

But we have some new problems: the menace of long-run inflation, the menace of long-run militarization, and the menace of mutual destruction through building our defenses so strong that they give security to none.

Long-run inflation is all about us. Every time the stock market moves up, some trading specialist finds a new formula to explain the phenomenon. But in my book none is needed save the fact of our constant failure to balance the budget and the steady increase in the manufacture of personal and industrial credits.

I stood in 1947 with Jesse Jones in his proud city of Houston while he pointed out to me the rising landscape as he brought his buildings up to a uniform height of 22 stories. I asked him why he did not retrench rather than expand.

"Because," said he, "we will be in an inflation cycle for years to come. We can't afford a depression with our huge national debt. We can't let the dollars shrink." How wise he was.

Long-run militarization we know too well. The powers of destruction gain faster than our ability to control them. Every year the planes fly faster and higher. Every year as their speed increases, the power to resist attack is lessened. But the planes of our enemy likewise improve until no man is safe, even in his own house.

So we come to the menace of mutual destruction—the odd chance that some desperate leader may trigger an atomic or nuclear war where there can be no victory but only the destruction of all.

A week from tonight many of us will prepare to leave for a proving grounds to see if there is a new and promising crop of fantastic weapons. That is our responsibility

and we must certify to the Congress that this Nation is ready.

Ready for what? To blow another people into powder or be decimated ourselves? Ready to loose new forces that we but partly understand, and whose potency surprises even the magicians who make them? I cannot believe that is the best this Nation can contrive.

Rather I would believe that our Senate leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, spoke for all the Democrats in Congress when he declared:

"I shall fight to keep my party on the road of freedom and progress for America. * * * I shall never permit partisan zeal to become the instrument of discord that will tear America apart in the face of a threatening enemy. * * * I should like for the President to think, with justification, that Americans will back him—not as Republicans and not as Democrats—but as Americans who place the salvation of their Nation above all else."

This is a dark and troublesome hour in world affairs, but we can find our way to final peace if the Democrats of this Nation measure up to that leadership and determine that good faith to their Nation is more important than good fortune to their party.

North Carolina can help us to that goal.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD my annual St. Patrick's Day address which was broadcast over radio-TV station WXEL, and radio stations WJW and WERE, Cleveland, on Thursday, March 17:

Once again we commemorate the feast of St. Patrick and rejoice in his many wonderful gifts to our civilization.

The greatest of these gifts are of the spirit.

They are reflected in those great principles which recognize the special dignity of every man and serve as the steady guide for humanity in time of strife or tranquility.

The entire history of the United States is replete with St. Patrick's contributions, beginning with our fight for national independence.

The sons and daughters of Ireland, loyal always to the great inspiration of St. Patrick, have come to our shores and have helped us to become the great Nation that we are today.

As a great Nation among the powers of the world we have been called upon to assume grave responsibilities in an up-set world in which the very civilization heralded by St. Patrick is threatened with extinction.

It is therefore fitting on this, his feast day, that we recall to mind some of the signs of our time which carry bad tidings of the future.

It is now 10 years since the end of a war involving most of the nations and people of the world.

That war was costly, in terms of our manhood and our natural resources.

We fought that war against tyranny and for a golden era of peace, freedom, and prosperity for all mankind.

In the throes of that great struggle, suffering mankind was promised that those great goals would surely be attained and that finally there would be comity among all the nations of the earth.

Even before the end of active hostilities, we began to construct an organization for peace in whose councils all the nations would be represented.

At war's end, all mankind held high hopes for, and placed great faith in, a peaceful future.

In the 10 years that have passed, but a moment in the long history of mankind, many events have taken place which have shaken confidence in our ability to reach those worthy goals.

Our first shock came when it became clear that all the nations of the world would not be included in the United Nations organization.

Some nations were to be severely punished and purged before they would be considered for membership.

Other nations, taking no part whatsoever in the war, and long recognized as peaceful nations, were denied membership because of the objections of the Russians. Unhappily, Ireland, the home of St. Patrick, and the mother of many great leaders in the fight for human liberty, was one of those nations excluded from the councils of the United Nations.

The second great shock came from the Russians who, in violation of all their solemn pledges during the war, brought under ruthless slavery the many nations and peoples our sons and daughters fought and died to liberate during World War II.

It would seem that then we in the free world failed to recognize the terrible significance of these events, because we did little or nothing about them.

We surely did not recognize these events as a threat to peace, because we failed to use the United Nations in order to prevent these acts of aggression.

Our third great shock came when the Russians threatened to overrun Greece and Turkey in their geopolitical drive to split the world. We became aroused at this turn of events, because a great American, President Truman, took a stand against Communist aggression and pronounced the Truman doctrine.

His significant act awakened the West from a deep slumber.

The next great shock came when the Russians attempted to force the western allies out of Berlin by means of a blockade.

This was another test of the determination of the United States to fight for the cause of freedom.

This challenge was met, and the Russian bullies backed down.

Then came Korea.

The Russians, using a small corps of North Koreans and hardened veterans of the Chinese Communist army, invaded South Korea for the purpose of driving the Americans into the sea and enslaving all Korea.

Without hesitation, President Truman met this challenge, and after terrible sacrifices the Communist aggressors were driven back north of the 38th parallel.

Then followed a protracted period of negotiations climaxed by a dubious armistice for which the Communists have shown their complete disdain by breaking it time and time again.

In the process, Red China was branded an aggressor in the Korean war by the United Nations.

Still another blow at the hopes of mankind was the Communist aggression in Indochina. When another Russian stooge, Ho Chi Min, fully supported by the Chinese Communists, brought about more bloodshed and terrible human suffering.

While all these shocks were taking place the United Nations, in one degree or another, became involved, but in none of these instances was the United Nations able to measure up to the reasonable hopes imposed in it by mankind.

Twenty years ago, in 1935, a great Irish statesman, Eamon De Valera, speaking before

the League of Nations when that body was considering Mussolini's aggression against Abyssinia, warned that this was its crucial test.

That if it allowed aggression against a small and defenseless country to go unpunished, its days were numbered.

Ireland, unfortunately, is still not admitted to the councils of the United Nations.

She is still blocked by the atheistic Communists of Russia.

The prophetic words of Eamon De Valera could well be spoken in the councils of the United Nations today.

What he said in 1935 fits perfectly the crisis that now faces the United Nations, an organization for peace in which we put such high hopes.

I feel certain that if Ireland were represented, the issue that De Valera raised in 1935 would be raised again in the councils of the United Nations in an effort to reestablish law and morality in the conduct of affairs between nations, and to avoid what, at the moment, seems to be an uninterrupted trend toward world war III.

It seems very strange that today there should be any talk whatsoever about admitting Red China to the United Nations.

Red China, an aggressor and initiator of the Korean war, a violator of every tenet of international law, defiant and disdainful of all pleas made by the United Nations, has no right whatever to membership in the United Nations.

If Red China be admitted to the United Nations there would be no doubt but that the criteria for membership is the ability of a nation to wage aggressive war rather than its hopes and aspirations for peace.

There are some who still believe that it is possible to satisfy the appetite of a dictator.

A good example of this notion is found in the crisis created by the Chinese Communists in their efforts to destroy what is left of free China.

At the beginning of this crisis, certain of the islands of still free China were voluntarily evacuated and turned over to the Communists.

By devious twisting of the facts, this evacuation was built up as a great victory for peace.

It was depicted as a victory because the evacuating force was not attacked by the Communists while they were in the process of handing over to them, territory that belonged to free China.

That is peace at any price.

All liberty-loving people were shocked upon receiving the news that the Chinese Communists held, without foundation, many Americans in their prisons and refused to release them.

Most of these Americans are members of the armed services.

We were horrified to learn how these Americans were being brainwashed and that many of those whose personality had been destroyed were returned to us so that they could cause further confusion and damage to the cause of liberty.

It was not so many years ago that the holding of one single American by a foreign power, without cause, would have been considered a most serious offense and likely to lead to war if not quickly and satisfactorily remedied.

But today it seems that the unchanging values and immutable principles which brought America to its present position in the world, have lost their meaning and their purpose.

It may be that we, as a nation, have been subjected to a brainwashing which has dimmed our fundamental beliefs and confused us as to what is right and what is wrong.

Are we to believe that nothing is black or nothing is white, but everything is gray?

Is this what is happening to us as a nation and a people as we seek to avoid war, and

continue our fight for peace, freedom, and prosperity?

That is the fundamental question of our times.

It is not a question of patience, as some would have us believe. Rather it is a question of right or wrong.

We must at all times be impatient to see that right is done in the conduct of all the affairs of mankind.

And we must be equally impatient to prevent and stamp out that which is wrong.

Failing to do this, we will have signed our own death warrant and prepared the way for the fall of our entire civilization.

On this, the feast of St. Patrick, we must begin to reassess our values and to reexamine our mission in a sadly upset world.

We must make it clear that we, as a nation, know the difference between right and wrong.

We must also make it clear that we propose to stand up for that which is right and to oppose with all our vigor that which is wrong.

We must also make it clear that we place the greatest value upon things of the spirit and not upon material gain.

Above all, we must make it clear beyond any doubt to all the people of the world that no sacrifice is too great for us to make in support of those great spiritual values without which our Nation would soon cease to exist.

I believe that adherence to sound moral principles is St. Patrick's greatest gift to America and to all other peoples of the world who have felt the warmth of his teachings.

America has been blessed with an abundance of his favors, and I pray to God we will begin to take full advantage of these great assets.

An Act To Provide for the Protection of Public Property Near the Shores of the United States From Damage by Waves and Currents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced yesterday H. R. 5363 entitled "An act to provide for the protection of public property near the shores of the United States from damage by waves and currents," which has as its purpose what I believe to be a realistic and reasonable approach to one of the most serious problems facing many areas of our country where beach erosion, or the threat thereof, exists.

Under recent legislation concerning this subject matter of beach erosion, including Public Law 520, 71st Congress, 1930; Public Law 409, 74th Congress, 1935; Public Law 166, 79th Congress, 1945; and Public Law 727, 79th Congress, 1946, the Federal Government participates, upon a finding by the Beach Erosion Board of public interest being involved, to the extent of one-third of that portion of the cost of the project allocable solely to the protection of Federal, State, municipal, and other publicly owned property that abut immediately upon the water. The result of the pres-

ent legislation is, therefore, that in many instances, the Federal participation is inconsequential and obviously does not accomplish the purpose intended by Congress, that is, that the Federal Government should make reasonable contributions in beach-erosion projects where public property is involved, in threatened beach-erosion areas. For instance, to take a specific example, there was approved by the Beach Erosion Board, the United States Army Engineers, and by the last session of Congress, the Pinellas County, Fla., project, at a total estimated cost of \$717,350, of which the Federal share is \$34,300, which is unquestionably justified in that the cost-benefit ratio of the total \$25 million project is 4.2. Due to the minimal amount of publicly owned property that immediately fronts on the shore, it is seen that the Federal contribution is only approximately 5 percent.

To further substantiate the fact that there is no question of justification of this project from the standpoint of the existence of a storm threat, the report to the Public Works Committee shows that 19 storms struck the general area between 1901 and 1950, inclusive, resulting in an average annual loss by annual erosion damage of \$112,400. During the last 4-year period the area involved has appreciated tremendously in real value, in that millions of dollars in improvements have taken place.

Thus, under the present formula and existing legislation, and with the Pinellas County project as a specific example, the contribution of the Federal Government is very minimal despite the fact that substantial municipal, county, and State property that does not directly abut the shore is constantly subject to the threat of storm damage and erosion. This is true because the 25-mile string of islands involved is comparatively narrow and there is a public road extending in most instances within the erosion damage range of the entire coastline. Presently the Federal Government has no authority to participate through Federal contribution in the protection of any of this publicly owned property, simply because it does not actually abut on the water, although it is extremely subject to storm and erosion damage action by the water. This is only one of the examples of which many could be cited, where publicly owned property is affected by erosion from which there is no protection whatsoever and, under existing legislation, is not being reasonably carried out. The object of my bill is to some degree bring the Federal participation realistically in line with the existing threat to publicly owned property. Without this bill many needed beach-erosion projects have not been undertaken, partially due to the unfair and high percentage of participation required of local interests.

It will be noted that my bill is in no sense a windfall to the intervening private property between the publicly owned property and the shore, in that the formula for participation has been reduced to one-sixth in determining public interest that there may be a substantial benefit resulting to the public property as compared to the benefit

which might conceivably be derived by private property.

This bill is the result of lengthy conferences with the United States Army engineers and a representative of the Federal Beach Erosion Board, and it is hoped that it is a sufficiently realistic approach to a very serious national problem that it will merit the favorable consideration of the Public Works Committee and this Congress.

The International Atomic Energy Program—Address by Hon. Morehead Patterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement relative to the International Atomic Energy Agency and negotiations for worldwide peaceful application of this great nuclear force.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement and the attached speech by the Honorable Morehead Patterson be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and appended speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The world has noted with interest the latest example of Soviet duplicity: Izvestia, characteristically, has just denounced President Eisenhower's effort for worldwide peaceful application of atomic energy. Izvestia slandered the historic address made by our Chief Executive on December 8, 1953, before the United Nations General Assembly.

Thus, once more, the Soviet Union brands itself in the eyes of the world as an opponent of all reasonable steps actually to harness this great force for man's benefit, and to prevent it from being used for man's destruction.

The Soviet Union's course with respect to President Eisenhower's efforts represent a typical instance of the Soviet Union's talking out of both sides of its mouth at the same time. This situation proves once more the Soviet tendency to lie unendingly, to propagandize unconsciously.

Nevertheless, we are not disheartened. We are not discouraged. We are not going to permit Soviet sabotage to impair our efforts in relation to working out with the free nations the great plans which have been spelled out by our Chief Executive.

MANY PROBLEMS LIE BEFORE US

I have noted with deep interest the progress of many of the free nations in their nuclear reactor programs or the beginnings of such programs.

I feel that we are entering upon a new age in which many underdeveloped nations can span the gap toward industrialization with a speed which might heretofore have been inconceivable.

There are, of course, a great many technical and economic problems which must still be resolved before atomic energy can be produced economically for peaceful power purposes. This is not going to happen overnight by waving a magic wand, but that it is

going to happen within a reasonable time is certain. We are sure that under the great leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, we will, in concert with freemen everywhere move toward the goals which we have set for ourselves.

ADDRESS BY MOREHEAD PATTERSON

America is fortunate that we have as our United States representative for international atomic energy negotiations an outstanding citizen, a leading businessman (president of the American Machine & Foundry Co.), a man who has already proved his mettle in U. N. conferences on disarmament, Mr. Morehead Patterson.

I was pleased the other day to read the text of an address which Mr. Patterson delivered at the opening of the School of Nuclear Sciences and Engineering in Chicago. In it, he voices many extremely significant observations with regard to the future peaceful application of atomic energy on an international scale. This is Mr. Patterson's first public address in his new capacity.

AN HISTORIC CHAPTER

This overall subject is, of course, no mere passing matter.

I believe that when the history of these times is written, the role played by President Eisenhower in the atoms-for-peace plan will constitute one of the most significant chapters of our times.

I believe, too, that the vital role played by Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in pioneering in the peaceful application of atomic energy, will likewise stand as one of the outstanding roles of a public servant in our time.

In the flux of day-to-day events, let us keep these immensely significant contributions in mind.

Let us bear in mind, too, that it is the genius of United States free enterprise which is in the vanguard of actually carrying out the technical details of this work.

VITAL WORK OF ATOMIC INDUSTRIAL FORUM

Fortunately, a great many of America's finest companies, including many in my own State, are now laying sound plans to cooperate with our Government in peaceful use of the atom.

The Atomic Industrial Forum is serving invaluable in this overall effort.

American business is thus demonstrating to the world its vision and resourcefulness in opening a new chapter in our free-enterprise system. And Government is giving the "green light" as fast as security considerations and other problems will permit.

Meanwhile, on the international scale, America is acting upon her unparalleled opportunity to serve man's welfare and to strengthen relations with all free nations, as well as trying to come to some meeting ground with the east.

SPEECH AND EDITORIAL

There follow now excerpts from the text of Mr. Patterson's vital address.

It is followed by an editorial from the March 17 Milwaukee Journal, describing the significance of the historic occasion at the opening of the school.

I may note that Mr. Patterson is going to address an important conference in San Francisco on April 4, conducted by the Atomic Industrial Forum and Stanford Research Institute. The theme of the conference is Atomic Energy—The New Industrial Frontier. Other speakers will include Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Nobel prize winner, and Dr. Edward Teller, famed nuclear scientist. This meeting at the Mark Hopkins Hotel is typical of the very significant work being spearheaded by the Atomic Industrial Forum, in acquainting United States business with its opportunities and responsibilities in the atomic age.

MAN'S BENEFITS FROM THE ATOM

(Address by Ambassador Morehead Patterson, United States representative for international atomic-energy negotiations, at the opening of the School of Nuclear Sciences and Engineering, Chicago, Ill., March 13, 1955)

This day will long be remembered by peoples everywhere. It marks the beginning of an extensive, permanent program of international educational exchange applying the knowledge of the atom to the betterment and the improvement of mankind.

You who come from every continent of this earth are true trailblazers in this historic program of peaceful cooperation. Representatives from 19 countries are ready to begin here at the School of Nuclear Sciences and Engineering a most unique and fruitful program.

Each of you is a living testimonial to the desire that burns in all the world's people—to help one another toward greater health, security, and well-being. Through your studies here you will have the opportunity to make a substantial contribution toward that end for your own countries and peoples and for all the countries and all the peoples of the world.

The opening of this school is a true realization of the hope that modern man can learn to overcome his fears and his misunderstandings in much the same way that we have learned and are still learning to fathom the infinite mysteries of nature and to apply them to the benefit of all.

This School of Nuclear Sciences and Engineering equally represents a most remarkable advance along the path of international cooperation. One of the greatest obstacles to the speedier development of the peaceful uses of the atom is the lack of a large enough body of scientists and technicians trained to deal with nuclear materials. We cannot have powerplants operating by atomic fission, for instance, until we have technicians who know how to operate them. As a result, we must train a large body of individuals all over the world who can grasp the problems and know what is required to work safely and effectively with atomic materials. There are substantial numbers of reactor engineers in the United States, in the United Kingdom, and in Canada, and there are quite a few in other lands. Their number must be rapidly increased, especially today. That is exactly what we are trying to do with this school and with this course.

The existence of this school for the exchange of know-how to the benefit of mankind is a typical way in which the American people desire to express their deep and genuine hatred of war and their devotion to peace. History has shown that the American civilization flourishes in peace. War, and especially war in the 20th century, must of necessity bring with it the type of economic regimentation which is destructive of the finest and most productive values in American life.

It is for these simple reasons that the harnessing of the atom for peaceful purposes is a natural and inevitable step for the American people. And this, by the same definition, is an advance which the American people like and prefer to share with their friends abroad. Similarly, it was natural and easy, though admittedly naive, for the American people to disarm rapidly soon after the end of both World Wars. What other country could have demobilized 8 million men in 10 months? It was also natural and easy for the American people to offer to give up their most powerful weapon of war—the atom bomb—and internationalize atomic energy. Despite the fact that the United States had a monopoly of that weapon at that time, the sole condition made was that a foolproof system of safeguards be established. Those were easy, unhesitant decisions for the United States. The difficult

and trying decision is to maintain preparedness. While the atom takes on a primary peaceful aspect, we shall not weaken our defenses to the detriment of real security.

The unique course you are about to begin is the natural consequence of another memorable event. On December 8, 1953, the President of the United States delivered a message of hope to the world—a broad plan for turning the atom to peaceful uses.

He thus proposed that the benefits of atomic energy be used for the good of all mankind, and not confined to the few States that by an act of God, so to speak, have atomic know-how.

The impact of the President's thoughts was great. It stirred the imaginations of people all over the world and created a tremendous wave of enthusiasm which even a dash of Russian cold water failed to chill. It was also greeted by some with cynicism and pessimism.

Such was the enthusiasm that many were inclined to overestimate and forget the practical difficulties involved in putting the atom to work. Some have concluded that in a very short time—perhaps next month or next year—we would find ourselves in a rose-tinted era of atomic plenty. All of us—in industry, in science, and in positions of public responsibility for the peaceful development of nuclear energy—have contributed in some measure to this excessive public optimism on how much we can expect from the atom, and how soon. Sometimes we compete with one another to see who can take the longest leap into outer space in projecting the overnight transformation of every aspect of human life through the application of atomic power. One could argue that there is nothing drastically wrong with this dreaming.

The free world was not alone in this contemplation of atomic possibilities. What, for instance, have the Russians to say on this subject? Let me quote from a recent article in the Soviet magazine *New Generation* (Smena):

"The use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes will permit the correcting of many of nature's mistakes . . . the Turgai Gates might be blown up to open the way for Siberian rivers to flow south to Central Asia and Kazakhstan."

Other projects which this article promised are "irrigating such deserts as the Sahara, construction of a colossal powerplant in the Straits of Gibraltar, building a dam in the Bering Straits which would be connected with a series of other structures that would direct the warm streams of the Pacific Ocean to the Arctic Ocean to warm the areas beyond the Arctic Circle."

While the article then indicated that all this could happen immediately, it points out that these "earth-shaking schemes will have to wait for the end of capitalism."

From what we really know, none of these earth-shaking schemes nor, in passing, the end of capitalism is imminent.

So much for the optimists.
Now for the pessimists.

A respected political leader in one country suggests that we give up hope of ever being able to solve all atomic problems; that we turn back the clock and that the United States "throw all its atom bombs into the deep Antarctic and begin a new world free from fear." Of course, this would mean a complete halt to the development of peaceful uses of the atom, since the basic fissionable materials that we would throw into the Antarctic would be the same as the materials used in powerplants.

The road which the United States is presently following is not that of unrealizable earth-shaking schemes; or is it the road of despair which would abandon all hope of progress because of its dangers. We are seeking to move forward constructively and practically with steady steps toward our goal of

making the atom a real servant of mankind. We hope and know that each year will show advances over the previous year.

I am deeply convinced that the atom holds limitless potentialities for human good. Science and industry, hand in hand with the Government, will level the barriers that stand between us and its useful application. By focusing increased attention on these problems and the freer exchange of information between countries—which is reflected in the school here—the time for achieving appreciable results will get shorter. Every promise has 3 dimensions, 1 of which is time.

We will bring about only disappointment, and perhaps even disillusionment and despair, if people become persuaded that all this represents a quick or easy assignment.

The Sahara just cannot be made to bloom next year.

The face of the globe cannot be altered to turn the North Pole into a tropic paradise the year after that.

We must realize that great human and material effort must still be exerted before we can tap the atom's full potential; and that, even when we do, it will not be the answer to every problem in every corner of the earth.

This state of mind can easily be described by the old maxim: Before we can run, we must learn to walk.

In the public discussions on the potentials of the atom the aspect that has attracted principal attention until now is the prospect of cheap and plentiful electric power, using nuclear materials as fuel.

So many countries are in need of new fuel sources and the world's energy requirements are rising so rapidly that much of our immediate hope for the atom is concentrated in this field. A good part of your own time at this school will be devoted to certain aspects of this subject.

The countries which you represent hope to realize many benefits from the development of reliable and economical powerplants utilizing nuclear fuels as soon as possible. For each country the timetable of this development will vary. The power requirements of your countries are increasing rapidly each year. For example, I understand that the rise in Portugal amounts to 20 percent per year.

At the same time the conventional sources of fuel—solid fuels, liquid fuels, and water power—are generally inadequate today and can be expanded only with difficulty.

Let us be specific for a moment: In France and Belgium the solid fuels which up until now have been the chief source of energy are becoming more expensive to produce and there is little possibility of rapid expansion of production. The recent discoveries of oil in France are indeed encouraging but will probably be used for purposes other than energy.

In Switzerland, Sweden, Portugal, and Greece expansion of hydroelectric resources is definitely limited and there is no substantial production of liquid or solid fuels.

Portugal fortunately has rich deposits of uranium. In Spain with its limited hydroelectric and solid fuel resources we look forward to especially rapid increase in the demands for power.

To turn to Asia: The hydroelectric and solid fuel resources of Japan are already entirely inadequate to take care of its highly industrialized economy. There is no oil production.

In the Philippines even today we find a desperate power shortage which impedes the industrial development of the country.

Thailand is completely dependent on imported fuel to meet its power requirements.

In Pakistan domestic production of fuels is equal to only about one-fourth of present consumption requirements.

Indonesia is more fortunate than some of its neighbors because of its nearly unlimited resources in petroleum. However, its vast populations should benefit especially from

applications of the atoms in the field of health and agriculture.

Israel has as yet found neither liquids nor solid fuels in its borders.

Australia has large solid fuel resources. Yet its program for expanding its economy should benefit materially from harnessing the atom for peace, especially since Australia is a potentially large producer of uranium.

There are a number of peaceful uses of the atom now being developed which could be extremely helpful to Egypt in solving its unique economic problems. I refer in particular to the tracer techniques as applied to agriculture and to the considerable experimentation now going on to develop economical methods of transforming sea water to fresh water.

To turn to the Western Hemisphere: Of the countries represented in this course only Mexico has at the present time adequate developed fuel resources within its borders; all four states—Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, and Mexico—have embarked on programs of industrial development which can benefit materially from the atom.

I think it is safe to say that every one of you when you return to your homes will find problems in your countries at least in the planning stage to which you can apply immediately and profitably the knowledge and skills which you will acquire in these courses.

To my mind, the best way to illustrate where we stand today in the realm of atomic power is to draw an analogy between the development of aviation in the early years of this century and the present stage of development of atomic energy.

In the late twenties—many here will recall—a wave of enthusiasm engulfed the world in connection with the benefits to be derived by mankind from the peaceful uses of the aeroplane. Up to that time, the chief developments in aircraft had all been military. Little serious thought was given to the commercial use of planes. Suddenly, the world seemed to visualize a tremendous future for civil aviation.

The headway in civil aviation has, of course, been impressive. It has brought material benefits to all of us. And yet very few of us can commute to work by air; even fewer drop out of the skies to visit their friends for an evening. Railroads, steamers, and buses continue to run, and the use of automobiles has increased many times more rapidly than the use of the planes.

The reason why the dreams of the twenties are still only partly realized is a simple one: With aviation, something new was added to the complexities of travel—the law of gravity. Flying is not dangerous. The danger begins when the motor fails and you stop flying. Ever since the Wright brothers made their first flight our ingenuity has been focused in two directions: First, on ways to make planes safer and more reliable; and second, on the training of technicians—the pilots and ground crews. We have made enormous strides in this direction.

Today after 50 years of constant experimentation and improvement, air travel has become so safe that our major airlines fly millions of miles each year without a casualty. They solved the safety problem, just as you, and others like you, will solve the problems inherent in the safe application of atomic power. But it took time.

We are going to get a great deal from the atom, but it is foolhardy to tell ourselves we are going to accomplish this revolution overnight.

I am confident that the will and the ability to solve these many problems will be found. Indeed, an occasion like this one here today represents the best assurance that the thinking of experts from all nations can and will

be focused on the prompt and effective solution of problems which man has the ingenuity to conquer. Out of such fine cooperation can come only good.

These past months progress has been made toward international cooperation in peaceful uses of the atom. We have moved forward on the path leading to the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency as suggested by President Eisenhower. A draft statute for such an agency has been prepared and is presently under active negotiation. Included in this statute are numerous constructive steps suggested during the lengthy and helpful debate on this subject in the last United Nations General Assembly. It would be premature to discuss today the details of the proposed agency. Soon there will be in existence an active international agency to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I hope that many of you will share in the work of this agency.

The opening of the School for Nuclear Science and Engineering is yet another step toward this important path of international cooperation to bring out greater peaceful uses of the atom. So is the forthcoming Technical Conference on the atom in Geneva in August.

Highly significant in the operation of this school is its worldwide representation, spread all over the globe.

We might call the roll to bring out this vital fact:

From Africa, Egypt is represented here; Australia is represented. From Asia we have here students from Japan, Pakistan, Israel, Thailand, Philippines, and Indonesia. Europe is represented by Belgium, France, Greece, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. America is represented by Guatemala and Mexico and by Argentina and Brazil.

We certainly should have a good start in developing trained technicians all over the world.

By this school and by joint participation we have made a real move toward international cooperation in harnessing the atom for peace. The message of hope which the President of the United States gave to the United Nations a little over a year ago has become today a reality. More will be done in the future.

In the future when we have an International Atomic Energy Agency, as visualized by the President, I hope that all countries with atomic know-how, including the Soviet Union, will invite citizens of all nations to participate in their training programs on an exchange basis. The International Atomic Energy Agency may have training programs of its own; and in any event, it can assist materially in arranging for spreading atomic know-how everywhere.

I congratulate the Atomic Energy Commission for its broad vision in establishing this school. I congratulate the staff of the school for the careful and skillful arrangements which, I am convinced, will make the courses a success.

And I congratulate you, the students from foreign lands, who will go back to your countries as pioneers in this great work. You signify the urgency expressed throughout the world for affirmative action to assure the survival of humanity on this planet—survival in the face of possible widespread destruction from the use of this same atomic energy for war only. I think it is the justifiable hope of the world that as peaceful uses of atomic energy become universal and the power systems of the world become more and more dependent upon it, its destructive use in all-out war may become less likely. In this sense the development of nuclear power would have significance far beyond the economic sphere which is the perspective in which it is generally considered today. In this sense your efforts as pioneers in your countries in this field may well qualify you

for the blessed reward promised to peacemakers. You will be in that enviable position of making the world we live in better, more secure, and healthier. This represents real hope. By exchanging know-how and ideas all men benefit. The American people by their action in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy have dedicated themselves to that goal.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 17, 1955]

REPAYING OUR ATOMIC DEBT

America this week started sharing with other nations of the world some of the knowledge and skills that have given us preeminence in the realm of atomic science.

At the Argonne National Laboratory, southwest of Chicago, representatives of 19 foreign lands gathered for the opening of the new School of Nuclear Science and Engineering. There they will learn the techniques of operating atomic reactors so they may return home and pass on their knowledge to others. Thus will be created a body of technicians for the constructive use of atomic energy.

One may properly take pride in this example of American generosity. But, in truth, it represents only a partial repayment of the immense contributions made to our earlier atomic effort by scientists of foreign lands.

The roll of these scientists was called, in part, at ceremonies opening the school: Einstein, of Germany; Fermi, of Italy; Bohr, of Denmark; Breit, of Russia; Szilard and Wigner, of Hungary; Zinn, of Canada; they and many others; and before them Hahn and Strassman, of Germany; Cockcroft, of England; the Curies, of France and Poland.

Not until the present modest beginning has been vastly broadened can we mark the debt paid. President Eisenhower sketched the outlines in his electrifying atoms-for-peace proposal to the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art found by all who sincerely seek Thee and known by those who love Thee and seen by all whose hearts are pure, may we now be numbered among the seekers and finders of God.

We penitently confess that we frequently enter upon a new day with many doubts and fears, for the future at times seems to be so dark and full of mystery.

Grant that when we are disquieted and disturbed by evil tidings may our restless spirits find their strength and refuge in Thee.

May we have within us Thy peace which passeth all understanding, which the world cannot give or take away, and help us to believe that in Thine own good time there shall be peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 18, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives;

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Committee on Government Operations on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs; and

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2576) entitled "An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55-10.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1956

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5085, Rept. No. 235) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

PAY RAISE FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the turnover among civilian employees of the